THE AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D.D., Editor

August, 1921 Vol. 9 No. 6

Editorial Comment - - - 483
Religion in London—Education at Harvard—A New Creed—How Should a Christian Observe Sunday?—A New Club for Churchwomen.

Schemes for Reunion---Roman and Protestant 489
George William Lincoln.

Young People and the Intellectual Problems of Religion 511
J. C. Hanckel Taylor.

Letters From a Modern Mystic, III - - 523

Religious Education - - - 536
G. Ashton Oldham.

The Gift of Ghostly Strength - - 544
Frank H. Hallock.

Letters From a Layman, IV. - - 551

Book Reviews - - - - 554

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, New Brunswick, N. J., under act of March 3, 1879.

Issued by the TEMPLE PUBLISHING CO., 1 and 3 Peace Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager
11 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.

Third Thousand

The Religion of The Prayer Book

BY THE REV. J. G. H. BARRY, D.D.

AND

THE REV. SELDEN P. DELANY, D.D.

12mo. 275 Pages. Cloth. Price, $1.75

(Third Edition, December, 1920)

ANNOUNCEMENT

From time to time complaints are made that the price of religious books is prohibitive of wide circulation, especially of such circulation as might be made in parishes and through parochial agencies for the better instruction of the people. Authors are frequently asked why they do not make cheap editions of their books to meet parochial needs. The authors of "The Religion of the Prayer Book" have determined to offer an edition of their book for this purpose. They will publish an edition bound with paper covers at the cost of fifty cents a copy. The edition will not be made unless 1000 copies are subscribed for before September 15, 1921. The edition will not be on sale by the trade, and can be obtained only through advanced subscription. Delivery will be made in October. The authors have asked their publisher to receive all orders for this Special Edition.

J. G. H. BARRY, D.D.,
SELDEN PEABODY DELANY, D.D.,
Authors.

August, 1921

FROM THE LONDON CHURCH TIMES

"The book is fresh and sensible and human; where it deals with practical and not speculative difficulties it has the touch of a pastor who knows the heart and its needs. No book quite like it has been published of late, that we know, on this side of the Anglican world, and it certainly fills a gap."

FROM THE LIVING CHURCH

"Dr. Barry and his associate, Dr. Delany, have done a good work in making plain, in this volume, just what the religion of the Prayer Book is. They take the book and examine it from cover to cover, going over its offices in some detail, to show that it at least permits (and in most cases positively enjoins) all that the Catholic-minded clergy and laity practise. In interpreting the Prayer Book, the principle to which the authors hold is that its statements are not to be explained by reference to the views of contemporary theologians through a catena of authorities, but these statements are to be takens in their simple grammatical meaning, compared with other parts of the book, and then, if the interpretation be challenged, the official documents of the Church, not the unofficial teaching of some of her clergy, are to be the recourse of those who seek its essential teaching."

The new book by Dr. Barry and Dr. Delany entitled "The Religion of the Prayer Book," is a serious attempt to examine the various offices and rites, and to ascertain if possible just what kind of a religion the Prayer Book teaches. This is a subject of prime importance to all Churchmen in view of the revision of the Prayer Book that is now under way. It is also a subject that must interest all those who are perplexed by the various pronouncements of bishops and priests on matters of faith. For it cannot be insisted on too strongly that the Book of Common Prayer is for Anglicans the authoritative expression of the mind of the Church.

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Publisher
11 W. 45TH STREET, NEW YORK

NOW READY

THE PARISH

Its Life, Its Organization, Its Responsibility, and Its Divine Contacts

A Handbook for the Clergy and Laity, by the Rev. WILLIAM A. R. GOODWIN, D.D., rector of St. Paul's Church, Rochester, N. Y. With Introduction by the Rt. Rev. Chas. H. Brent, D.D., Bishop of Western New York. *Cloth,* 150 *pages. Price,* $1.50.

This is an exceedingly practical book relating to the management of a Parish and the work of a Parish Priest. "No rector of a parish," says Bishop Brent, "can fail to get benefit from a close study of these pages." "We must recognize," he continues, "that organization well carried out is not a burden but a relief. It is a labor-saving device. This, however, does not mean that it is a means by which a lazy rector can shift personal responsibility from himself to a machine." "It is intended to aid men who are already bent on using their vitality up to the hilt, to use it effectively and economically."

Contents: The Church as a Living Organism; The Organization of a Parish; The Teaching Mission of the Church; Church Teaching and the Reconstruction Problem; The Pastor and His People; Parish Harmony Notes; Worship and Service.

MOREHOUSE PUBLISHING CO.

1801-1811 Fond du Lac Avenue **Milwaukee, Wis.**

Art
of the
13th Century

Ecclesiastical Statues of Devotion for Churches and Private Oratories

Polychromed and Gilded after the manner of the 13th century

ROBERT ROBBINS

49 Christopher St.

NEW YORK

INEXPENSIVE VESTMENTS

Eucharistic

(Five Pieces)

Each Set

White, Red, Black,
Green and Violet .....$22.00 up
Lined with silk $5.00 more

Stoles

Two yards long $4.50
Three yards long 6.00

Birettas

Cloth and Silk Copes $50.00

Linens

Albs, Cottas and Amices

MISS BERTHA M. HOBBS

563 Amsterdam Ave.

NEW YORK CITY

Correspondence Solicited
References Given

CONTRIBUTORS FOR AUGUST

The Rev. George William Lincoln is Librarian of the University Club of Philadelphia.

The Rev. J. C. Hanckel Taylor is the Rector of Christ Church, Cape Girardeau, Missouri.

The Rev. G. Ashton Oldham is the Rector of St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.

The Rev. Frank H. Hallock, D.D., is Professor of Old Testament Literature and Theology in Seabury Divinity School, Faribault, Minnesota.

The American Church Monthly

A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing with questions confronting the Anglican Communion and more especially the Church in the United States

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

1-3 Peace St., New Brunswick, N. J.

President: George A. Armour, Princeton, N. J.
Vice-President: Hon. William J. Tully, Corning, N. Y.
Secretary: The Rev. Charles C. Edmunds, D.D., 6 Chelsea Square, New York
Treasurer: Haley Fiske, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

Three Dollars a Year — Twenty-five Cents a Copy
Canadian subscription, $3.25 a Year — Foreign subscription, $3.50 a Year

Volume IX — August, 1921 — Number 6

Religion In London

THE Dean of St. Paul's in London, Dr. Inge, has been endowed by his Maker with a keen intellect, and a power of expressing his thoughts in forceful and gripping English. Furthermore his remarks necessarily attract wide-spread attention because of the prestige of his position. No man in England today has a richer opportunity to commend Christ and His religion to the hearts and minds of English-speaking people everywhere. Instead of that he seems to be content with exhibiting his cleverness by making addresses and writing on every conceivable subject except religion. Is it any wonder that the abolition of deans is seriously discussed in England?

The other day we noted the two following items of English news in a New York newspaper. We print them in parallel columns to emphasize the contrast between these two eminent representatives of Anglican and Roman Catholicism:

"Dean Inge, speaking before the British Science Guild in London, said that he thought a campaign against ignorance was very necessary. The Englishman was a very good fellow, but he was very stupid. Tennyson said, "Let the ape and tiger die," but that was not much use if they were still confronted by that much more intractable animal, the donkey. The Guild of Science must contemplate humanity as Job contemplated Behemoth, the hippopotamus. "He is the chief of the works of God, and who can measure the thickness of his skull?"

"The most remarkable function in the celebration by Cardinal Bourne, Archbishop of Westminster, of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his consecration as Bishop," says the London *Times*, "was a public demonstration of Roman Catholic faith and worship in the streets of the metropolis. This was a pilgrimage by clergy and laity from Newgate to Tyburn—'the sacred way of the English martyrs,' as it is known to Roman Catholics—the highway along which the priests condemned to death in the time of Elizabeth were conveyed on hurdles, and hanged, drawn and quartered where the Marble Arch now stands. At the conclusion of the march, Cardinal Bourne gave Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament from the balcony of the Tyburn Convent, just beyond the Marble Arch, and the consecrated Host was worshipped by a kneeling crowd. The pilgrimage has frequently been held, but the holding of the distinctively Roman service of Benediction by an English cardinal in the open air has probably not taken place for centuries."

It takes only a rudimentary knowledge of social psychology to enable one to judge which of these two representatives of religion will make a deeper impression upon the people of London: the brilliant Dean who dispenses gloomy comments on progress and population, or the Cardinal Archbishop who reaches the hearts of the populace through the gateway of the senses and induces them to kneel in the streets in profound homage and adoration before their unseen Saviour.

Education At Harvard

THE Ivy Orator of this year's graduating class at Harvard, whose function it is to amuse the vast throng which assembles in the Stadium on Class Day, spoke wiser than he knew when, after referring to the perilous experiences his classmates had survived in the pursuit of a

sheepskin, he exclaimed: "The best thing we got out of Harvard was—ourselves!"

This brief remark expresses admirably the purpose of a college education. It is too often thought of as merely the passing creditably the required number of courses. It is distinctly to the credit of the Harvard authorities that they will no longer give a degree merely for the attainment of certain marks, but that they insist on a man's passing satisfactorily a general examination on the whole subject to which he has given special attention during his years at college. He must demonstrate that he knows how to think, as well as to express his thought clearly and forcibly; and that he is an educated man in at least one department of human knowledge. Thus the purpose of education is held to be not the completion of a number of courses, but the completion and development of oneself.

Harvard has taken another momentous step in the interest of clearer thinking and more liberal education by founding a new chair of Scholastic Philosophy. Professor Maurice DeWulf, of Louvain, has been appointed to this chair. This is an extraordinary department for this old university of Puritan and Unitarian traditions. It is almost an acknowledgement of the bankruptcy of such modern philosophic schools as Idealism, Determinism, and Pragmatitism. At any rate it signifies a willingness to look into the official philosophy of the Catholic Church of the West, in which all her priests have been trained since the time of St. Thomas Aquinas. Harvard has heretofore treated the Catholic system of thought as rather a negligible system. In view of its long continued vitality, its coherence and definiteness, the monumental work of Cardinal Mercier on Neo-scholasticism, and the eminence of Catholic men of science, no university worthy of the name can afford to do so in the future.

A New Creed

THE State Street Congregational Church of Portland, which is the leading representative of that denomination in Maine, has adopted the following new creed, to take the place of the antiquated and hampering Creed of the Apostles:

"I believe in one Infinite and Eternal God, the Father of all mankind, the Giver of every good and perfect gift, and the Source of every noble thought and purpose.

"I believe in Jesus Christ who best reveals to us the nature and the will of our Heavenly Father.

"I believe that it is our Heavenly Father's will that all men everywhere should love and serve each other as brothers.

"I believe that the Holy Spirit is ever ready to help us in our striving for goodness and truth, and in our efforts to advance the kingdom of heaven on earth."

It ought to be possible for Unitarians and Congregationalists to unite on this broad platform, as it contains no reference to the Divinity of Christ, His Virgin Birth, or His Resurrection. Neither is there any expressed belief in the Church. It is apparently enough to say that all men are brothers, and that we should try to be good.

We welcome the frankness of these Congregationalists. What is the use of saying you accept the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, when all that you really believe in can be expressed so much more simply?

How Should A Christian Observe Sunday?

A CHRISTIAN should observe Sunday as the Lord's Day. It belongs not to him but to the Lord. We have six days in which to concern ourselves with our business and pleasures. Sunday is an opportunity to devote

ourselves to the worship of God and the study of religion and prayerful meditation upon spiritual truths. It is not a question of what the law of God requires. In Christ we are free from the bondage of the law. St. Paul established that principle once for all. The Church however has, for the hardness of people's hearts who insist on law, laid down the precept that we should observe Sunday by abstaining from all unnecessary labor and being present at the Lord's service. That is the minimum of obligation. But generous and large-hearted Christians, who really love their Saviour and His Church, will not be content with doing what they must. They will want to do all they can for the Lord. They will therefore make use of every opportunity provided for them on the Lord's Day to worship God, to feed their souls with spiritual food, to be in a heavenly atmosphere, to be quiet and listen to the voice of God speaking in their souls. They will not feel that they have done their whole duty when they have gone to an early mass. They will also go to a late mass and to vespers; they will teach a class in the Church School; they will call on the sick and the afflicted; they will do some spiritual reading; and they will occasionally spend the whole day as a day of retreat.

A Club For Churchwomen

ONE of the most interesting developments of church work undertaken recently, is the organization by The Churchwoman's League for Patriotic Service of a Churchwoman's Club in New York City.

A club-house will be opened in the fall which will contain pleasant clubrooms, bedrooms, and a good restaurant. It will be centrally located and will be of real service to women coming into the city to stay over night or for a longer visit. The club will be a rallying place where

lay problems can be discussed and acted upon from the viewpoint of church members, a center for thought and purpose, comfort and hospitality for churchwomen of the city and all over the country.

Members have already been enrolled as far away as Houston, Texas, and many suburban women have said that a club of this kind is just what they need in New York. Mothers with young daughters coming into the city to go to the theatre or a dance will find the club a convenient and suitable place for them to spend the night. Busy professional and business women living in New York, or coming to the city frequently, say that this club will solve the housing problem for them, certainly one of the worst with which they have to contend. Representatives from church organizations coming to the city for quarterly meetings will be assured of comfortable and convenient headquarters at a minimum of expense and effort. In every place that the plan has been presented, it has met with instant success.

Any churchwoman who desires further information about the club or who wishes to secure a membership blank is asked to apply to Mrs. Malcolm Macfarlane, 8 West 47th street, New York City.

Schemes for Reunion—Roman and Protestant

Rev. George William Lincoln

AMONG the Essays of Lord Bacon there is one which bears upon a matter which is largely, and perhaps not so wisely, discussed at the present time. It is that one entitled "of Unity in Religion." In a very brief space it states what are the fruits of unity, namely the avoidance of scandal, and the securing of peace. The bounds of unity are to be sought between two limits, excessive zeal on one hand, and extreme laxity on the other. Jehu is given as an instance of the former, while the Laodiceans furnish the text for the latter. But the climax is to be found in the statement that "there be two false peaces of Unities: the one, when the peace is grounded but upon an implicit ignorance, for all colours will agree in the dark; the other when it is pieced up upon a direct admission of contraries in fundamental points, for truth and falsehood in such things, are like the iron and clay of Nebuchadnezzar's image; they may cleave, but they will not incorporate."

Bacon's caution needs to be remembered at the present time when so many and such extravagant demands are being put forth by those in authority for what they call reunion. In all the utterances up to the present time there is not one, as far as can be discovered, in which there is the slightest intimation that there is such an awful verity as the revelation of God, and that one of the purposes of the Church is to protect that revelation from addition or diminution.

For reunion is in the air, so to speak. On every side there are many and manifest evidences that earnest and

thoughtful people—women as well as men—are dissatisfied with the confusion and turmoil everywhere present in the religious world. The intolerable evils of separation are being recognized as never before. There seems to be a dim perception that a divided and discordant Christendom is not according to the mind of its Founder. Then there is the waste of men and money and time; the fearful overlapping in so many instances; the failure of missionary enterprise; the baneful effect of all this upon the honest sceptic at home and the astounded spectator in the mission field. There are the economic reasons, as they are termed, which demand that this state of spiritual anarchy should be ended as soon and as satisfactorily as possible. It is well, however, to note here before going any further that these so-called economic reasons originate from what is termed the business sense, and completely leave out of view the real questions of faith and order and worship and discipline. They are overlooked; or if they are mentioned they are brushed aside impatiently as matters not worth considering.

Now no one would question that these are great evils, blots on the Church's escutcheon, insuperable obstacles to the extension of God's Kingdom, and that it would be a blessing if they could be eliminated once and for all. But until there is unity of faith it is a mere waste of time and effort to talk about reunion. When men believe alike they always act in harmony and concord; and when their beliefs are contrary they differ and they have been known to fight to a finish. This is a fact which stands out in bold colors on the pages of history. It furnishes instance after instance where schemes of reunion, carefully thought out and developed with pains, have come to nothing because there has been no unity

of belief. To come to any permanent unity there must be some accord on the principles which are to be followed. The only agreement possible between two men, one of whom believes that there is a revelation of God which all must accept, while the other flatly denies that there can be such a thing, is the agreement to differ. To talk of the reunion of these two is to talk arrant nonsence. If there is no common premise upon which there is whole-hearted agreement, the conclusion will always be a hopeless difference. To agree there must be one starting point for all.

It is this fact that there must be unity of faith before there can be agreement or co-operation which is so clouded at the present time. Even more, it can be stated without the slightest fear of contradiction that the belief in the faith once for all delivered to the saints and the conviction that the Church is the guardian and keeper of this deposit are in antagonism to what is called the spirit of the age. Creighton described it accurately when he wrote:

> The whole method of the growth of scientific thought with which this age is permeated is averse to the conception of the truth having been once for all revealed. Theology cannot be a developing science in the same sense as other sciences are, because truth does not change, though there is a variety in the truths which at different times most prominently occupy the thoughts of religious people; at the beginning of this century the doctrine of the Atonement was emphasized, today the doctrine of the Incarnation.
>
> All these various tendencies combine to produce a nebulous form of religion. The desire to get at the spirit of a thing without going through the process necessary to understand it is very hazardous. People demand that theology should be immediately obvious to them, without their having taken any trouble to get hold of it. This is partly due to the insolence so common at present, which leads a man to think that he can dispense with any discipline of character or of intelligence. . . . It leads to the destruction of Christianity as

> a religion, and converts it into a sort of moral philosophy, which rests upon the notion that the "spiritual man" is merely "the natural man" at his best, and does not realize that the "spiritual man" is a "new creature."
>
> Religion is always decaying in the hands of the multitude; it has to be revived by individuals, and we who are engaged in teaching Christianity as a religion, as the means of establishing a relation between the soul and God, must never allow it to fall into the sphere of the world's activities.[1]

It may be granted at the outset that no one who has the slightest love for Christ and His holy Church can do otherwise than grieve sorely at the spectacle which Christendom, using that word in its broadest sense, presents to the world, to devils, to angels. No one denies that we all are eager and desirous of reunion, but it must be reunion in accordance with our own views, and upon our own lines. Nowhere is this fact clearer than in the latest work on reunion from the Roman point of view. "The Problem of Reunion," by the Rev. L. J. Walker, an English Jesuit, who had been an army chaplain. He deplores the present state of affairs, and finds the solution in uniting the religious world in two separate bodies. The first is an amalgam of every known Protestant body, in which he graciously includes the whole Anglican Communion; the other is the Church of Rome organized, ruled, governed and directed by its infallible head—the Pope. That scheme will mean the abatement of all the present evils, and at the same time be a visible representation of the great benefits of unity. All this will make for Rome, and the final act of the drama will be the absorption of united Protestantism in the Church of Rome, and then there will be in great reality one fold and one shepherd. Fr. Walker does not hint when all this will take place, but it must be borne in mind that he tries to sacrifice the Anglican Communion

[1] "Life and Letters of Mandell Creighton," Vol. II, p. 247.

between the upper millstone of Protestantism and the nether of ultra montanism. This fact alone should open the eyes of everybody, and make them realize that before they begin to talk about reunion and formulate schemes, it would be best to know just exactly what reunion means and what it involves.

For history from the time of the schism between the east and the west has been a record of abortive and disastrous schemes, to patch up the rents in the Church. Well meant they were, and animated by the love of God, but they all turned out disastrous failures. It would be wise, then, for those among us who are talking so loudly about the evils of disunion and the blessings of union to beware lest they add one more to the long list of failures.

Now, it cannot be denied that the first idea which underlay any scheme of reform or reunion was that of compulsion or force. It was the dominant idea at the Council of Constance in 1415, where one of the leading questions was the pacification of Bohemia and the reconciliation of the followers of John Huss to the Church which had just succeeded in quieting the schism by which it had been rent for the past thirty years. There was but one way of reunion: open complete retractation of previous errors and abject submission to the terms laid down by the Pope and the Council. If this end could not be reached by disputation and conference, force must be employed. And the final result was that John Huss and Jerome of Prague were burnt at the stake as obstinate heretics, although both of them had been given safe conducts to Constance by the Pope John XXIII and the Emperor Sigismund. If the reunion of the Church could be obtained in no other way it must be sought by the force of broken oaths and inhuman cruelty.

But the results were not just what Pope and Emperor

and Council had anticipated, for the subsequent wars in Bohemia and the disturbances throughout Germany showed that reunion could not be obtained by the use of force. So when the question of reunion with the Eastern Church came up at Florence in 1436, matters were handled in a very different spirit. The Council was transferred to Ferrara in 1438, because the Pope Eugenius IV was suspicious of the Florentines who were unruly citizens at best, and also to be able to control the doings of the Council more thoroughly. The events of the past few years had opened the eyes of men to the fact that compulsion would never bring about reunion, so this time another method of gaining the desired end was employed—the use of money. The Greeks were poor and were hard pressed by the Turks. They needed help to resist the latter; if they were not paid their travelling and living expenses they could not come to Ferrara. So the Greek Emperor, the Patriarch and twenty-two Bishops sailed for Italy in the galleys which the Pope had sent for their use. On their arrival at Ferrara the question at once arose how were they to be provided for. "The Pope at first proposed to supply the Greeks with food; this they resisted and demanded an allowance in money. Ultimately the Pope gave way; it was agreed that the Marquis of Ferrara should furnish them with lodgings, and the Pope give the Emperor thirty florins a month, the Patriarch twenty-five, the prelates four, and the other attendants three." To put the matter in the vernacular, the Pope had bought up the whole delegation. They were nothing less than the stipendiaries of the Pope, and when they did not vote according to his purpose they could easily be brought to terms by withholding the monthly payments. It was a shrewd scheme, but the only permanent results of the Council were the deflection of Bessarion, the Greek who subsequently became a Cardinal

and was even nominated to be Pope, and the courage of Mark of Ephesus, who boldly refused to sign the decrees and returned home a hero. Creighton's judgment of the Council is not only fair, but it is the only one which can be drawn:

> It is difficult to feel much sympathy with the reluctant Greeks. They knew, or they might have known, when they left their home what they had to expect. It was a question of political expediency whether or no it was desirable to abandon their attitude of isolation, and seek a place amid the nations of Western Christendom. If so, they must expect to make some sacrifice of their ancient independence, to overthrow some of the walls of partition which their conservatism had erected between themselves and the Latin Church. An acknowledgment of the Papal Supremacy was the necessary price for Papal aid. It was useless to appear as beggars and demand all the privileges of independence.[2]

Whenever the scheme for reunion has been based upon force or compulsion, physical or material, as the case may be, failure has been its characteristic. It has never succeeded in turning men from their own point of view. It has never worked, for while oppression and persecution may seem for a time to serve the desired purpose, the end always has been that the sufferers were only strengthened in their position. Their doctrines may have been driven under ground, but that was all. Sooner or later they appeared again with redoubled energy. So now no one looks to force or compulsion to secure reunion, and that method of procedure has been abandoned. The other schemes which are struggling for the mastery at the present time are I—Submission; II—Compromise; III—Comprehension. They will be briefly considered in that order.

I

Submission, unqualified, unconditional, whole-hearted submission is the theory of the Roman Communion. She

[2] "History of the Papacy," Vol. II, p. 190.

not only will not consider any other; she knows no other. It is a theory faultless in its logic; clear and sharp cut as a crystal. If the premises upon which it is based are granted, there is absolutely no escape from the conclusion. One is driven on step by step by a stern inexorable logic, which can only be avoided by refusing to reason correctly.

It is the theory which is pressed home most vigorously upon all who are non-Romans. It is the handy weapon of the controversialist, who knows how to make the most of it. Newman says in his "Grammar of Assent" that any one who gives his assent to the belief in the existence of God has gone three-quarters of the way to Rome. Exaggerated as this statement may appear, it is very largely supported by the words of the Jesuit, Fr. Walker:

> The Catholic Church—*i. e.*, those Churches the world over which are in communion with Rome, claims that in her, and in her alone, is to be found the concrete embodiment and living expression of this Messias. So, too, for that matter does the Orthodox Church, though her claim is less well founded, since she possesses neither catholicity, nor in the full sense unity. It is also of less consequence, since it is as little likely ever to be accepted by Protestants as it is by Catholics. Moreover, it was in the Roman communion that all other Christian Churches grew up, whether as colleagues or as children, and from it they broke away, the Orthodox and Heterodox Churches of the east, no less than the Protestant Churches of the west. Recognizing, therefore, that there can be only one living embodiment and expression of the Messias, the Catholic Church maintains that other Churches, in thus separating themselves from her unity, went out from the true Church and no longer belong to it. In them Christ does not abide corporately as He does abide in His own Church. With them the living Messias is not one, and through them does not speak, as He is one with, and does speak through her.[3]

No language could be clearer than this; the starting

[3] "The Problem of Reunion," p. 214.

point is the assumption that the Roman Church is the mystical body of Christ, and apart from her there is no organic union with Christ. It does not halt or hesitate in the slightest, but proceeds from the presuppositions which are taken for granted to the conclusions which inevitably result if these are not denied. To talk about the Uniat Churches is not only beside the mark, but a mere waste of time and energy. As Vailhe says:

> The Uniat Church, or Uniats, embraces all the eastern Churches in communion with Rome, but following other than the Latin Rite, whether it be Byzantine, Armenian, Syrian, Chaldean, Merronite or Coptic. They are Greek only in name.[4]

Rome knows but one road to reunion; she has no theories to proclaim or advocate; she is the one true Church, the Bride of Christ on earth, and her claims, no matter what they may involve, must be accepted *en bloc.* There can be no questioning, no arguing about the matter. If certain concessions are granted, if certain privileges are permitted as in the case of the Uniats of the east, it is because her supremacy in all matters concerning the faith and order and worship of the Church is acknowledged without a murmur. The Pope is not merely the successor of S. Peter, but the Vicar of Christ upon earth, the Head of the Church infallible, and unquestionable.

If this may seem to some an overstatement of the question, it is well to let Newman state the matter, and his language will put an end to all uncertainty:

> I reflected that a law implied a lawgiver, and that so orderly and majestic a growth of doctrine in the Catholic Church, contrasted with the deadness and helplessness, or the vague changes and contradictions in the presence of other religious bodies, argued a spiritual Presence in Rome, which was nowhere else, and which constituted a presumption that Rome was right; if the doctrine of

[4] "Catholic Encyclopædia," Vol. VI, p. 755.

> Eucharist was not from heaven, why should the doctrine of Original Sin be? If the Athanasian Creed was from heaven, why not the Creed of Pope Pius? This was a use of Analogy beside and beyond Butler's use of it; and then, when I had recognized its force in the development of doctrine, I was led to apply it to the Evidences of Religion, and in this sense I came to say what I have said in the "Apologia." "There is no *medium* in true philosophy," "to a perfectly consistent mind," "between Atheism and Catholicity." [5]

II

While submission to the Pope as the Vicar of Christ, the successor of S. Peter, the infallible head of the Church is the one and only form of reunion which is known and accepted by Rome, compromise is the basis from which all the Protestant theories of reunion start. The postulate is, theology is not religion, but a human science, and like all human sciences subject to development, change and discard. Some things are true; some are questionable and uncertain; in every religious system there are some doctrines which may be termed vital and some which are superfluous and unnecessary. These are the things which separate men and keep them divided into rival sects; therefore it is the part of wisdom to come to some agreement upon what may be deemed necessary and then throw the rest into the scrap heap. Nowhere is this idea more clearly expressed than in an article by Mr. W. L. Shepherd, in *Harper's Magazine* for August, 1920. It purports to be a conversation with one whom he designates as "an eminent Churchman known throughout the country," but whose identity he carefully conceals:

> Theology has been knocked into a cocked hat. Theology isn't religion, and the trouble with the Church is that it has mistaken it for religion. Theology doesn't heal broken hearts; it doesn't teach us how to follow in the footsteps of Christ. The Church is

[5] Newman, "Grammar of Assent," p. 498.

> an organization based on religion. Theology is a code for operating that organization. Our churches of all denominations have been trying to walk on two legs—one of religion and one of theology. Indeed, I think some of us have been trying to hop on that one leg of theology. The thing that will save the Church today is to step out solidly on religion, and stand planted there like the Rock of Ages. The world wants to know about Christ, not what we ministers think about Christ.

If this statement can be taken as fair evidence of the spirit which is prevailing in the world of religious thought today, then there is no such thing as a fixed unalterable standard of faith. Everything is in a state of flux, to be adapted to the prevailing standards. It reaches its logical result in the statements made in the recent work of Kirsopp Lake and Foakes-Jackson.

There is baldly asserted that Christ never founded a Church or instituted the Sacrament of Baptism. Of course, to those who hold this, reunion is reached by a short and easy path. To use a mathematical figure all fractions must be reduced to the lowest common denominator. One difference in faith or polity is set against another, which is its opposite. These cancel each other, and the process is continued until a residuum is reached which is common to both, and so unity is arrived at. The Creed, whether Nicene or Athanasian, is a human invention; it is a product of human thought and study, and, like everything else human, is subject to change. What man has built man can as readily tear down. What has been evolved in the course of time must be adapted to the demands of the age. Some of the English Protestants scornfully derided the Lambeth Proposition on the ground that it was absurd to expect men of today to confess their faith in language which belonged to theological and philosophic thought in the fourth century. In all of the discussions of the present day, at least among those who con-

sider themselves the leaders of religious thought, there is hardly any realization of the vital importance of the main Christian doctrines. One looks in vain for any recognition of the truth which is so admirably expressed by the Rev. Walter J. Carey:

> They are no theological speculations; they assert the true grounds of the salvation of mankind. Take away the Incarnation and man remains impotent, sinful and powerless. Take away the Atonement, and man is not put right with God. Take away the Resurrection, and we are left guessing whether a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice has been made at all. Take away the Holy Spirit and all remains in the air. Mankind in the ideal is right with God, but no actual men and women are saved by that incorporation into Christ which is the Spirit's work. Take away evangelical preaching and sacramental grace, and the Spirit is maimed in the principal instruments by which He summons and then joins individuals to Christ.
>
> Take away the Church, and all the essential Brotherhood is lost which finds its base in the unity and solidity of the human nature which Christ took and redeemed. So far from Creeds being obsolete or unnecessary, they are the inevitable proclamation by believing hearts of the triumphant foundations of their salvation: "We are saved and thus it happened." [6]

Or to go a little farther and see how compromise starts from something closely akin to Pythonism read Aubrey Moore's lucid statement of the relation of theology to religion:

> Theology is, in S. Paul's words, the attempt "to know the things of God." It implies that reason is coming forward, not to criticise but to establish, to interpret, to defend, the truths hitherto accepted as the witness of the heart and conscience. Religion and theology in different ways have to do with the knowledge of God and of spiritual truth. They have the same object—God, but their aim and their method are different. Religion *knows* God; theology is concerned with the idea of God; religion sees, theology *thinks*. Religion begins and ends in an almost unconscious attitude of wor-

[6] "The Church Times," August 13, 1920.

> ship, theology rationalizes and defines the characteristics of the Object of worship. Theology makes explicit what is implicit in religion. It takes the facts which the religious consciousness has seized, seeks to bring them into distinctness before the mental vision, to connect them with one another in a coherent system, and find in them the explanation and the unity of all that is. Christian theology grows out of Christian religion, as Greek philosophy grew out of Greek mythology. But religion is a Divine *life*, theology a Divine *science*.[7]

To any one who accepts this conclusion, reunion by the way of compromise, of adjusting the differences and reconciling the mutual contradictions, compromise seems more than hopeless. An acid and alkali will not remain the same when they are united, for the result is something different, a salt which is neither, though it may be affected in its nature by the qualities of both. So when different religious bodies unite by way of compromise, the result is that each maintains its own standards of worship and polity, and tolerates those of the other.

That this is no mere fancy sketch but a plain statement of facts is shown by the declaration put forward by the General Synod of the Moravian Church on June 22, 1909, in answer to the Lambeth declaration of 1908:

> We hold that intercommunion with the Anglican Church must rest on the same mutual recognition and freedom to co-operate as now exists between us and several Churches, Episcopal and other, in Europe and America; and corporate reunion not being in question, we regard our position as that of an independent branch of the Church Catholic, "an Ancient Protestant Episcopal Church, as described in the Act of Parliament, 22 Geo. II, cap. 120."
>
> We cordially agree in principle to the mutual recognition of the authorities of the respective Churches in their several functions; and in regard to the future position of our Bishops we consider that the interests of the effort towards intercommunion will be best served, and possible misunderstandings be most readily avoided, if

[7] A. L. Moore, "From Advent to Advent," p. 29.

> the principle of absolute independence within the separate jurisdictions of both churches is observed and maintained on the basis of mutual ecclesiastical equality.[8]

There is no need to pursue this branch of the subject any further. This one instance is sufficient to show what its logical result must be. *Ex uno disce omnes.*

III

One other scheme of reunion remains to be considered, that of comprehension. As nearly as can be gathered, this is what is implied in the recent Lambeth utterance on the "group system." It is very difficult to know exactly how much or how little is contained in that term. If it is to be taken in its widest sense, it means the absorption or the amalgamation of all the existing religious bodies in a vague, indefinite union. No one relinquishes anything; no one abandons any opinion. It means the perpetuation of all the existing abominations in one grand cesspool of error. It would include Arians, Sabellians, Nestorians and Eutychians. S. Peter and Simon Magus would go hand in hand. S. Paul and Elymas would be fellow missionaries. S. John and Cerinthus would compose a new Gospel. Athanasius and Arius would be codefenders of the Faith. Leo and Eutyches would draw up a new definition for Chalcedon. When Fr. Puller described the scheme as "all that motley crew contending with us and with themselves," he did not overstate the matter. It is not merely a vivid, but an accurate, description of what is implied by comprehension; it is the absorption and the perpetuation of every error and misbelief. It throws the truth into a vortex of contending theories, and is a denial that there is such a reality as the "deposit of faith," which cannot be increased or diminished. There is absolutely

[8] "Church Quarterly Review," October 1909, No. 137, Vol. LXIX, p. 25.

no distinction between the shifting and inconsistent utterances of human opinion and that coherence and certitude of principle which is the distinguishing mark of Divine revelation.

A French writer has said: *"L'unite doctrinale est le miracle permanent de l'Eglise."* "The truth it holds by, is of, and for all ages and all nations, because it is true it is part of the essential structure of all things." [9] It is just this which is ignored or lost sight of in the scheme of comprehension. It only repeats in another form Pilate's scornful question: "What is truth?" In fact, the more the document is studied, the less does it satisfy any one, the authors, perhaps, being excepted. It certainly does not appeal to Anglicans; the evidence is too clear to permit of the slightest doubt.

At the meeting of the Federation of Catholic Priests, held in London, September 28, 1920, Bishop Gore pointed out three defects and perils about the scheme, which it was impossible not to regard as grave.

First of all, nothing had been said about agreement upon the general idea or doctrine which lies behind the Sacraments. He deprecated reunion turning on the mere acceptance of Sacraments without insistence upon acceptance of the sacramental principle. He desired further definition of the Episcopal ordination which certain nonconformist ministers were to receive.

Secondly, there was the difficulty of contemplating the period of interunion. There would, for example, be persons debarred from celebrating in our Churches, but who were members of the clergy. This might give rise to difficulties which would result either in the restrictions being ignored, or intense dissatisfaction created.

And thirdly, there was the troublesome question in-

[9] Selwyn, "Theology," October, 1920, p. 212.

volved in the loose definition of what constituted Church membership. In this connection it may be well to consider very briefly the Basis of Reunion, which has been recently set forth by the Lambeth Conference. In Section VI of the Appeal in the Resolution it is said:

> We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole hearted acceptenace of the Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the ultimate rule and standard of faith; and the Creed, commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief.
>
> The divinely instituted Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ.
>
> A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the Authority of the whole body.

Now it must ever be kept in mind that this appeal is addressed to the whole world, and not to any particular section or part. It looks, if it means anything, to the Catholic as well as to the Protestant, and can only be weighed and considered from this point of view. If either one side or the other is neglected, or not addressed, then the whole scheme falls to the ground. And what is even worse, when the matter is brought to an actual test, one is left speechless in astonishment. To tell a Roman or an Eastern that we are willing to unite with him, if he believes the Scriptures, accepts two of the Sacraments, and has an episcopally ordained priesthood, is neither bold, nor considerate; nor charitable. It is nothing less than a piece of sheer impertinence, to use the very mildest term.

On the other hand, if the appeal is to form the basis of reunion with the numerous Protestant sects, it is as full of holes as the proverbial colander. In fact, it breaks

down of its own weight. That this is no careless, random assertion will be readily seen if the report of the Theological Committee of the English Church Union is to be followed. The Committee says:

> Considerable additions are needed if this statement is to be made satisfactory: (1) Unless to the phrase "the Creed, commonly called Nicene," there is added some such explanations as "interpreted by the dogmatic decisions and the tradition of the whole Church" a door is left open for the heresies condemned by the Third and Fourth Œcumenical Councils and for other grave errors; (2) unless some addition is made as to belief in the doctrine of the Sacraments there would be nothing to prevent the official recognition for the first time of Zwinglian errors concerning Baptism and the Holy Communion, and there ought to be security for the acceptance of Infant Baptism, and of a fundamentally right belief concerning Holy Matrimony; (3) it is insufficient to specify only the Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion—for instance, it is necessary that the place of Confirmation and Absolution in the sacramental system of the Church should be distinctly recognized, as in the Book of Common Prayer; (4) in regard to the ministry, a recognition that Ordination is the sacramental means of conferring the grace of Holy Orders, and not merely the appointment to a ministerial position is urgently needed. The phraseology used in Sections II, VI and VII of Resolution 9 of the Conference might be interpreted as suggesting that "the episcopate" is a mere matter of administrative convenience.[10]

To this grave indictment must be added another even graver—the omission to make even the slightest reference to the Sacrifice of the Altar, the central sun of the Church's worship. On this august subject the sacrificial character of the Eucharist—perhaps the most vital issue for religion now before us, because it connects directly with our conception of God, and its presentment, there is not so much as the veriest trace of any reference to be found in the whole document. It may have been an unintentional oversight, or it may have been owing to a delib-

[10] "Church Times, December 10, 1920, p. 589.

erate purpose to avoid a matter, on which there would have been disagreement, no one can tell; but the fact remains that the one great act of worship in its objective reality, in its Godward side, is omitted. It certainly leads to the suspicion that the ideal of some of those who are the keenest on reunion is that the Church is a bundle of sects tied together by some kind of submission to the episcopate, and that the Anglican Communion as an interim measure is a beautiful example of it.

At the same time and along the same line comes the question of Reservation. The issue cannot be avoided; it is a burning question which is of immense import to every priest who holds steadfastly to the immemorial faith and practice of the Church. It may be shelved quietly by the Lambeth Fathers, but how any one can expect organic union between those who are convinced of the necessity of Reservation, and whose constant and unbroken practice has been its practice, like the Roman Church for example, and those who scorn and deny and oppose it as Methodists, Presbyterians and latitudinarian Episcopalians, is to the writer an insoluble mystery. Yet the question comes up and will continue to come up whenever reunion is mentioned.

In spite of all that may be said to the contrary, one cannot avoid the uncomfortable suspicion that in this appeal there was a far greater effort made to soften Protestant prejudices than to approach openly and as near as possible the faith and practice of Catholic Christendom.

But if this idea of universal comprehension is unsatisfactory to Roman and Anglican, what is the Protestant response to the appeal? The best, in fact, the only answer is to be sought in the statements of those who are regarded as leaders of religious thought.

Dr. Francis G. Peabody, of Harvard, may be taken as

a representative of modern religious thought in Cambridge, if not in America. He writes:

> It may be urged that the Anglican Episcopate is a matter of sacred principle to its adherents, while the practice of non-Episcopal communions is merely a matter of convenience, so that as an American theologian has remarked "the principle of the sacramental and supernatural priesthood is outraged and threatened by any such passing to and fro between the Church and organized schism." This suggestion, however, only indicates how slightly the convictions of the Nonconformist conscience are appreciated, or even understood. The Baptist Churches, for example, number not less than six times as many members in the United States as does the Protestant Episcopal Church. They maintain that baptism by immersion after mature decision and repentance is the only method of initiation into the Christian Church, which conforms to the teaching and practice of Jesus Christ. Here is as definite and sacred a principle as is the authority of the Episcopate to the Anglican Communion, and one at least which has an equal endorsement in the records of the primitive Church. Is it possible, then, that, for the great cause of unity, certain bishops and clergy of the Anglican connection would offer themselves for baptism by immersion at the hands of their Nonconformist brethren precisely as they ask those brethren to accept Episcopal ordination for the same end? Such a suggestion is sufficient to indicate how the proposal of re-ordination affects the minds of ministers in the non-Episcopal Communions. Either it is a meaningless rite, to accept which would be sacrilege, or it is a divinely instituted form whereby its adherents are set apart from the main movement of the Protestant Churches. The Protestant Communions hold their ministry to be Scriptural, valid, and justified by its fruits. A proposal of reordination seems to them like a proposal of remarriage. A discrimination between the Church and the sects appears to them not only ungracious but unhistorical.[11]

So far, Dr. Peabody, the Harvard Professor. The statements of the English representatives of non-conformity are no less explicit and emphatic:

> In the Lambeth scheme Episcopal ordination is introduced as an

[11] "Hibbert Journal, January, 1921, p. 227.

> element in a scheme of mutual recognition. Its significance and purport in this connection are not quite clear to us. When it is proposed that Episcopalian clergy should be authorized to officiate in Free Churches through a form of commission or recognition which should commend their ministry to these congregations, and that Free Church ministers should be authorized to officiate in Anglican congregations by a commission through episcopal ordination, what is meant by this last crucial phrase? Is it meant that our ministers should be made ministers in the Church of God as the Ordinal in the Prayer Book phrases it? Or is it meant that, being already ministers in the Church of God, they are to be formally admitted and authorized to minister within the Church of England? If the former be the meaning, we are obviously thrown back again on the question of recognition. We should not be asked to accept any form which carries, or which could be construed to carry, this interpretation. If, on the other hand, the latter meaning be what is proposed, then certainly ordination is not the requisite or appropriate ceremony or word. Ordination to minister Christ's Word and Sacraments is a general thing to be given once for all; license to exercise it in any district or communion is a particular thing, which may, of course, be extended. But the two things are different in idea.[12]

A courteous but effective way of impaling the Anglican Episcopate upon the horns of a dilemma. From the evidence which has been presented, there is but one inference to be drawn—"the group system," whatever that may have meant in the minds of those who coined the phrase, satisfies nobody. It has been rejected by Roman, Anglican, American Protestant and English Dissenter. While they acknowledge the gentle humble-minded spirit in which it was set forth, they will have none of it. From present indications, it looks as if it would prove as useful as de Maistre's schemes of reunion through the Masons at one time, and at a much later that of Russia and the Papacy, on the ground that it was required by the political exigencies of the situation. It is just as unsatisfactory as

[12] "Church Times," March 21, 1921.

any of the other proposals, force, compulsion, compromise. Unless one is prepared to accept Fr. Walker's plan, the fully organized and developed Roman Communion, on the one hand, and an amorphous, headless aggregation, called the Protestant Church, on the other, no sign of organic unity, which is the only unity worth mentioning, is in sight. It is more than useless to talk of reunion when conditions exist, such as those now prevailing. The present state of the Church is far—very far—from being in the slightest degree conducive to reunion. As the Dean of King's College, E. M. Milner-White, Cambridge, said at the Anglo-Catholic Conference:

> We speak with many voices. Godly concord is little known amongst us. Some seem to set no store on her Catholic possessions, even hate and scorn them. Nay, more, there are many sins to be laid to her eagerly Catholic section—division and undiscipline and unwisdom, lack of big thought, even lack of love. To the best Roman minds, gazing from without, the Church of England is unintelligible, chaotic, contradictory, internecine. What a dangerous and impossible Church to contemplate reunion with![13]

While this is the viewpoint of Catholic tradition, that of Protestantism is no less emphatic. No priesthood, no sacrifice of the Altar, no Communion of Saints. Protestantism has repudiated and abhors even their mere mention. To unite with the Protestant, if these are not rejected, at least they must be regarded as open questions, which any one is at liberty to believe or disbelieve, according to his inclinations.

The outlook from either angle is not at all promising. Yet there is one task which lies at our own door, to which every one can lend assistance. It is nothing less than "to unify our own communion, on a demonstrably Catholic basis, however simple and unelaborate." [14]

---

[13] Report of the Anglo Catholic Congress, p. 95.
[14] Report of the Anglo Catholic Congress, p. 95.

No better statement of this aim can be found than the words of Milner-White:

> Our work is to render the diversity, one undoubtedly within Catholicism, instead of letting it decline to one between Protestant and Catholic. . . .
>
> *First,* we must make the unity between the Catholic-minded in our own communion perfect and peaceful. We should allow no feeling between Western use, Sarum use, and no particular use at all. Our union of love and alliance should embrace without suspicion or instruct all who live consciously by the Catholic essentials. . . .
>
> *Secondly,* we must do all we can to moderate our chronic disorder by our own reasonableness and patience, so that our loyalty and loving conduct are rendered infectious. It is just in this province that we ought to learn richly from our sister communion. After all, her compact oneness is built on discipline and obedience. If Catholics fail here, who shall help?
>
> *Thirdly,* let us teach unweariedly. Look back at the last seventy-five years. The battle for the Blessed Sacrament has been almost won; a deep, devotional life centers round the weekly, nay, the daily altar. The battle of the Sacrament of Penance has been half won. . . .
>
> There are other central doctrines, however, such as a living consciousness of the Communion of Saints, where our work has hardly begun. . . .
>
> If we only work together with quietness and confidence we are bound to win the battle, not for ourselves or for our theories as a party, but the battle for Catholic thought and practice, certainly in our own communion, probably in the whole Protestant world, whose head and guide by the mercy of God seems to be this Catholic Church of ours, not because it is Protestant, but just because it is Catholic.[15]

[15] Report of the Anglo Catholic Congress, pp. 95-96.

Young People and the Intellectual Problems of Religion

Rev. J. Hanckel Taylor

MY aim in writing this article is to arouse more of our clergy and laity to a sense of the pressing need of a more adequate, bolder facing of the problem of equipping our young men and women to face the inevitable intellectual difficulties of the day. It must be faced if we are to retain for the Church the best brains of the best trained elements in our nation.

I have in mind especially those who will later enter our colleges and universities; but in these days of increasing efficiency of high school education, the problems of science and religion are being more widely disseminated. Only recently I heard a very devout, earnest member of the Church tell of how his daughter, a young high school girl, came home one day and made some mention of "the missing link," and how he told her to go back and tell the teacher that if she was descended from an ape, she belonged to a different breed of animals from what his family did. In this conversation, this dear fellow and an equally devoted Methodist brother agreed that it is the height of folly and a matter of extreme danger to give any thought to any but a literal acceptance of every word of Scripture, in the light of the closing verses in the Revelation of St. John the Divine. That to these two men of more than average intelligence in matters of every day life, was an eternal voucher for the truth of every word of the Bible and such an eternal warning against all questionings as to bring horror to their hearts at the thought of any one daring to trespass on this sacred ground. What will be the outcome for the developing mind of the girl?

All of us know well the typical experience of the youth

of today. Their ideas of the Bible, as gathered from their more or less inadequate training in Sunday school, are in a vast majority of cases still too much founded upon a superstitious awe of a magical book, a book which is much like a house of cards—knock out one prop and the whole structure falls to the ground. With such ideas they enter college, and their traditional view of the Bible suffers just such a collapse, and with the downfall too often goes their religion. Perplexed and confused, the majority do one of two things. If the Church has a strong hold upon them and if they are not keenly sensitive to seeking truth, they make a compromise whereby they fit out a special apartment in the brain as a dwelling place for religion, with a sign board at the entrance, "No thinking allowed in here." Or if the Church has no strong hold upon their life, or if they insist upon intellectual wholeness, they drift away from the Church as being a relic of the past, regarding the clergy as dear old ignorant, perhaps lovable, but brainless souls. Only a few ever struggle through to firmer intelligent faith. The irony and tragedy of the whole thing is that a vast majority of these very clergy are themselves keenly aware of the problems, have indeed themselves been through these very same intellectual struggles, and often possess the means for solution. But the clergy and the Church are about the last place where the perplexed young man would dream of finding the help he needs, remembering, as he does, the character of instruction received in Sunday school, and perhaps not recalling even a suggestion ever having been made from the pulpit that such problems existed, or that these new scientific ideas can be believed and yet not destroy one's Christian faith.

In my own youth, and I am not yet thirty-five, I remember so well an incident in a Bible class of the Junior Brotherhood of St. Andrew. I raised the first dim and

elementary questionings of the conflict between the creation story in Genesis and the fact of the slow formation of the world. I was silenced by the leader's answer, "It is dangerous to ask such questions." Such an answer was to me as a red flag to a bull. I could give several such personal instances. I also have in mind a former Sunday school, boyhood, and college chum, who is now making a brilliant career in scientific circles; but who seems absolutely indifferent to Christianity. I think that he considers it something entirely outside of the realm of intelligent study, recently expressing surprise to me that the Church allowed any freedom of interpretation of Scripture. He may be at fault for never having taken the trouble to investigate religion intelligently; but can we blame him very much when the Church gave him no better nor more intelligent foundation in his religious training, especially as he was a most regular attendant of Sunday school and Church even up into his college days?

This is still too often the experience of many able minds. There is grave need for a bolder, more candid handling of the problem. The serious result of this deadening conservatism is that it is self-propagating by a process of vicious selection. We are constantly losing the intellectuals, and those remaining are, with brilliant exceptions, people who are either naturally very conservative or intellectually indolent, or who live more by feeling than by thought, or who are so engrossed in problems of every day life as to be obliged to accept their religious ideas on the traditional basis as they are handed out to them—and indeed this impossibility of the average person working out his own religious belief is one of the biggest difficulties in the whole problem. The process of the selection of the conservatives has been particularly active among our Sunday school teachers and to a more or less extent in recruiting men for the ministry. To my mind, this is the chief cause by

far of our failure to get the sufficient number and the right calibres of young men for the ministry. They are not only discouraged by their own intellectual difficulties, but they are not inspired by the apparent intellectual calibre of the ministry already in existence. I say "apparent," because, while there is, of course, much real weakness, a great deal of the outward appearance is due to our consistent hiding of the light of our intellectual understanding under the bushels of conservatism and accommodation to tradition.

In a recent lecture, Dr. Tyson of the University of the South, made the prophecy that the "greatest intellectual revolution which the Christian Church has ever been called upon to face is inevitably at the threshold of the present time. It is necessary to cleave to the modern, scientific point of view, and to still hold fast to the beliefs of an old historic Christianity if the younger generation is not entirely to forsake the Church, and if the old religious order is to be preserved . . . Don't put a water-tight bucket over your brain with intelligence on one side and religious belief on the other, with no attempts to bring the two together."

Such is the need of our time, but the difficulties are many when we begin to seek the solution. It is an easy matter and a favorite pastime of cheap intellects to arraign the clergy for narrowness, or intellectual dishonesty, or lack of courage, or neglect; and perhaps few of us are not to some extent guilty on one of these counts, or at any rate of over-caution. I for one plead guilty. But the practical problem is great and is fraught with many difficulties and pitfalls; and so I say let him beware who would lightly criticize the Church and her leaders. It is by no means an easy task to transmute a traditional faith into a strong intelligent grasp of the truth, there being grave danger of wreck along the way.

There is the difficulty of adequate time, both in pulpit and Sunday School, for any proper handling of big questions, a difficulty multiplied by the intermittent attendance of one's hearers, which debars systematic continuous development of the problems. Also people are with us today, and tomorrow they have moved to other influences; and newcomers appear without the background of preparation and foundation of thought which perhaps we have been endeavoring to provide for the building of our superstructure of truth. Then there are the greater demands of the vital moral and spiritual issues and needs, which touch more deeply the true life of the Church. Too much discussion of purely intellectual problems is at times like an officer's arguing the theory of war and of the construction of rifles with his men on the field of battle under fire of the enemy, when the need is that they charge forward with the knowledge and weapons they possess. But the two greatest difficulties are the intellectual inertia of the mass of people and the danger of destructive rather than constructive results of our teaching.

Let us consider the inertia of the mass. We cannot say even to ourselves, "Lo, I will believe this, or have this or that set of thoughts and ideas and feelings," regardless of the influence of those around us; and far less can we transfer any such set bodily into any given individuals, for we are but a fractional part of the many influences that go to form their thoughts and characters. Most of our boasted individualism is a false dream. We may indeed declare independence of certain authorities or influences. We are not, however much we may imagine ourselves to be, individual entities. Even the rankest agnostics or atheists, yes, even the intellectuals of the intellectual in our universities, are to a more or less extent controlled and influenced by the thought and ideas of the school of philosophy or

sciences to which they belong, as well as by the whole atmosphere of isolated intellectualism in which they dwell. We are all social beings, played upon by innumerable influences from the thoughts, feelings, and actions of those among whom we dwell. A large part of the agnosticism, for instance, in our universities is of a mass nature, not individually thought out, but absorbed from the atmosphere. So also with the conservatism of the Churches, the same invisible bonds of influence besides the outspoken and conscious exchange of thought, hold the mass of thought together, so that one who would seek to change it has a large task upon his hands. We can never rush forward in high gear, as it were, but must get the mass moving slowly in low. It is well, of course, that it should be so. Social life and sanity are only possible because of the solidarity of the mass.

But to return more directly to our subject under discussion, this inertia of the mass, especially of the mass of the matured people and parents of our congregations, greatly complicates the task of teaching the young along intellectual religious lines. This inertia is increased by the generally comparatively greater conservatism in thought, which prevails among the other branches of the Christian Church, with whom our people come into contact and by whose ideas they are greatly influenced. Of course, there are innumerable radical influences pulling people the other way; but the mass of the faithful are untouched by these; and even the unthinking indifferent Church member remains stationary in his religious concepts. We cannot isolate our classes of young men and women, even if we wanted to, from this surrounding atmosphere of conservatism. So when we attempt to teach new ideas, often they do not mean anything to our listeners. The atmosphere of traditional thought is so

dense as to prevent the penetration of the new light to any depth.

Moreover, when we do succeed in breaking through the conservative crust, we encounter the second of the two great difficulties, the danger of there being greater destructive than constructive results from our teaching. It requires the greatest possible skill to avoid this. As some one has said, it is easier to live as a slave than as a free man. Those who rejoice so much in freedom from authority often do not realize how exceedingly difficult a thing freedom is, if we are going to keep hold on the best in life. When through necessity or otherwise, we leave the beaten path and get out into the freedom of the woods, every step forward demands hard struggle, and a truly forward direction is maintained only with the greatest difficulty. Sometimes the woods become a jungle and the ground beneath an impassable swamp. This is often the explanation of the lure that Rome has for many minds. Cardinal Newman, for instance, took refuge in Rome as a haven from the struggle with doubt and uncertainty which he found unendurable. It is only the flippant superficial soul that gaily dances out into the pathless fields of freedom. The deeper soul may feel compelled to go, but he goes with more serious thought as the undaunted adventurer and seeker after truth.

But I am digressing. My point is that if we do bring home to the young ones these new religious conceptions, there is the danger always prevalent of serious destructive consequences of two kinds. The new ideas conflict so greatly with the thought and teachings of the parents and many others of their religious teachers that one tends to break down the influence of those of the older generation. The young are only too ready to assume that their elders are old-fashioned and out-of-date, not only in matters of intellect, but of morals and manners as well. Also, while

we may have broken the spell of the old intellectual conservatism, we may have failed to give any new constructive basis for thought and faith. New ideas are like dynamite. It is a serious and delicate responsibility this matter of implanting new ideas in religion, especially when the soil is richly fertilized with the bones of a dead discarded conservatism and so readily produces the rankest growth of any new weed. What then often seems to be lack of courage on the part of the clergy is really a mixture of perplexity as to how to proceed and of a timidity not for self, but for fear of the harm that may be done to the faith and lives of others.

We need, however, to realize that such timidity is working eventually vastly greater harm than a bolder attitude will do. We may indeed escape the immediate difficulties with the young, but they become lost in the wilderness when they enter college and university. From the dense mass of conservatism, often devoid of spiritual life, the young are plunged suddenly into the mass momentum of unbridled freedom of the universities; and the result can hardly fail to be disastrous to the thinking mind. I am not one of those who violently rail against the agnostic and atheistic influences of our university life. No doubt there are many individual professors who are like birds of prey seeking whose religious faith they may devour; and without doubt a little conservatism and less of the dogmatic egotism of many radicals would be greatly beneficial to many institutions; but I feel fully persuaded that a very large proportion of the wrecks of faith are due not to the storms of the sea or the dangers of the voyage, but to the improper fitting out of the ships before they leave the sheltered harbor of home and parish church. Violent reaction against the ultra-conservatism of thought in Sunday school and in pulpit is at least one primary cause. I know it by bitter personal experience. So though the

task be difficult and perplexing, we should attack it with determination and power. We need a more evident intellectual honesty, a franker recognition of the changes wrought in our traditional ideas, and a greater candor in presenting them to our people.

It may not be out of place here to repeat the words of a dear old-fashioned and earnest-souled clergyman, who was railing bitterly against all who sought to deprive people of their old beloved comforting religious beliefs and thoughts. To show his righteous wrath and indignation against all higher critics and their clan, he said something to this effect:—'Supposing that I had a son who had a fine hobby-horse, which he dearly loved, which he fed as if it were real, and stroked and petted its mane; or supposing that I had a little daughter, who owned a beautiful doll baby, which she loved with mother love, fed, bathed, and clothed, and treated in every way as if it were a real living baby; supposing then that some hard-hearted cruel man was to come in and mock this boy and girl and take the hobby-horse and precious doll and crush and grind them under feet—I tell you, were I not a clergyman and restrained by Christian charity, if I possessed the strength, I would hurl such a man bodily from my house." And thus would he wish to deal with those in the Church who teach in accord with modern thought. This is, of course, extreme; but the man in question is rector of a parish of nearly five hundred communicants; and tragedy of tragedies a wonderful choir of some forty boys sit under such preaching Sunday after Sunday—what an opportunity and what a tragic waste. Extreme as this is, there is entirely too much similar to it, and we who think differently are criminally timid in our presentation of the truth. We must furnish our youth with something better than the hobby-horses and the doll babies, images only of the truth. We must give them strong steeds of in-

telligent faith to carry them over the rough roads of life and precious living truth to grasp to their breasts in times of sorrow and of trial.

We see then the need and the challenge; but under all the conditions outlined above, what is the "How?", that word which stands at the very beginning of our title. I have no adequate answer, am only feebly struggling along myself; but here are a few suggestions.

First of all, we need more definite courage in our own minds, in our own conception of the truth. While holding firmly to the great essentials of the old, we should have greater boldness in seizing on to that which is true in the new. In the past we have been too much on the defensive. A truism of warfare is that the best defense is the offensive, as that alone can eventually win. Also in the recent war, there was demonstrated the folly of holding too long to untenable positions and thus wasting one's power. The wisdom of wide and rapid retreats, followed by strong counter-offensives, was brilliantly illustrated. Religion in the past has stuck too closely to the policy of dogged defense of every foot of the ground. We have never voluntarily yielded a traditional belief, but only when we were forced out by the sheer power of the attack. For instance, after the first chapter of Genesis became untenable as literal scientific data, many who were forced to yield that point, closed up the ranks of their thoughts on the next immediate line of defense, and persisted, or still do persist, in accepting all after that chapter as literal fact. They yielded only what they were absolutely forced to yield. We need to be bolder. We must definitely and quickly retire from all untenable ground, choose our own line of defense, and then with new forces, new methods, new conceptions of the whole conflict, yes, new objectives, we can make our counter-offensive successfully. To give this a specific application to the Old Testament, it seems to me

to imply a frank recognition that our Christian faith is absolutely independent of the truth or falsity of any given statement or story in the whole thereof. Then we can set forth successfully to regain and hold victoriously the great spiritual and moral realities of that ancient literature and of the religious experiences of the men of Israel, many of whom were veritable moral geniuses and spiritual giants. Frankly acknowledge the earthen character of the vessels, and then we are in a position to value truly and make known to others the inestimable treasures contained therein. The theologians who have saved and are saving for us the essence of Christian truth are those who approach the matter in this bold positive way.

Secondly, we must make definite systematic efforts to mold the thoughts of all of our people to the proven results of modern thought, or rather to impart to them the true spirit of intelligent approach to religious subjects. There should be nothing violently revolutionary, but a well directed consistent effort to remold thought gradually. In the words of a prayer of Dr. Nash's, we need to "work without haste and without rest." We do not need many sermons exclusively dealing with such problems, but our sermons should always be congenial to the atmosphere of modern thinking, with a frequent word thrown in to give light on some perplexing problem. Much more can be done, especially for the youth of the Church, through Bible class work, where there is more time for discussion and explanation and usually more systematic study. We should never speak dogmatically nor in a hostile spirit, but tactfully and suggestingly, often just giving the new idea as an alternative view held by self and others and found to be helpful. Our greatest work can be done personally with thinking individuals, when we can get them to open up their difficulties to us. But many who need our help are afraid of "shocking the parson."

Thus have I stated the problem at some length and indicated to a slight degree the direction of the solution. I hope that I may have kindled a spirit of interest in some who may help towards a more adequate working out of the difficulty. I close with the earnest hope, expressed in the words of another prayer of Dr. Nash's, that "God will day by day lead us deeper into the mystery of life, and make us interpreters of life to our fellows."

> Send out thy light and thy truth, O God, and lead us through the mists of ignorance, vanity and fear, into the clear shining of the perfect day of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

Letters from a Modern Mystic—III.

MY DEAR L——:

I want in this letter to tell about the third stage —the consummation and fulfilment—of the prayer life, the crowning experience that can come to human beings, the ultimate plane of the life of the spirit that is open to mortals in the flesh. The old-time mystics call this plane the Contemplative Life. That means little today. To try to state it in a sentence in modern terms: It is the immediate perception by finite mind of infinite, absolute Being, and the perception of that Being is Love. Out of the experience one can write forever of its nature and meaning. I will try simply to write such brief notes about it as will, on the one hand, make the experience, so far as possible, intelligible; and, on the other, tell something of its incommunicable beauty and worth.

The experience is a gift—something imparted, something granted. It is not earned, nor won, nor induced. Nothing causes it—it is utterly beyond causation, wholly above and outside the laws observable in the rest of human experience. The practice of Meditation—the prayer life on the second stage, described in my last letter—prepares the soul for the reception of this gift. The souls would certainly be few that could receive it without that preparation. But the practice of meditation, however long or however intensely prosecuted, does not and could by no possibility create or induce the experience. The experience is an outright gift of God.

With me it began with a time of surpassing heaviness of soul—a way of utter darkness, such a Gethsemane and Calvary as I had never before been called to pass through —the final dying of the self with Christ upon the cross. This was not independent of outward circumstances; yet the outward circumstances by no means explained it—

they were not in themselves so extreme or untoward. They provided the occasion, but the blackness of darkness was the hand of God covering my soul. There followed two or three days when my soul was as dead, insensate, save for an unceasing dull suffering, without emotion or volition—a stone. Then one day there came—how well I remember it!—just for a moment at first—the gentle lapping of a single little wave of life upon the cold dead stone that was my soul; one soft fleeting ray of light in the vast encompassing darkness, but how beautiful it was! The gentle wave lapping my dead soul, the soft radiance in the darkness, was the love of Jesus—for me. After a time it came again and lasted longer; then, shortly, again, then again in waves that began to crowd each other; then the waves disappeared in a flood, and the flood rose and rose and rose—and soon there was nothing else; the flood of Love had swallowed everything.

Now I suppose almost any one reading this would at once think of the waves and the flood as waves and a flood of emotion. But they were not. I had, in times long before this, experienced waves and floods of emotion from the overwhelming sense of God's love; I may write about that in a later letter. This is something entirely different —it is the perception of love. I perceived love first as gentle lapping waves, then as wave on wave, then as an all-embracing, all-engulfing flood. And then came the final experience, the true stage of Contemplation, when the perception became so true and immediate and intimate that thought and concept themselves were swallowed up; it was pure perception of the Infinite and Absolute—and to finite mind perception of the Infinite and Absolute must transcend thought and concept. The mental figure of the waves disappeared; the figure of the flood disappeared; the figure of rays, the figure of light, disappeared; all figures, all mental images disappeared; it was percep-

tion without thought, perception without concept—because it was immediate perception of the Infinite, and to perceive the Infinite is to be bereft of thought and concept.

Always, since that day, when I pray, when I seize for a moment for the "practice of the Presence," I withdraw into that thoughtless, conceptless state of mind, and just behold—contemplate—know—the Infinite, and know it as LOVE, pure, ineffable, all-encompassing, almighty Love.

To describe to another a state of mind one has to use images. The image that best serves for this state of mind is perhaps that of an enveloping grey mist—as the mind is lifted out of thought and concept into pure perception, pure contemplation. As the experience of the finite perceiving and knowing the Infinite it has to be described in contradictories; it is a strange emptiness, it is surpassing fulness; it is all darkness, it is the only perfect light; it is absence of knowing, it is the one true and final knowledge; it is barren endless desert, it is all wealth and beauty and luxuriance of overflowing life. It is all these, because it is the mind emptied of all its wonted activities, forms and images, and filled with the thought-transcending knowledge of infinite Being's fulness of Beauty, Love, and Power.

After the gift came to me I read *Theologia Germanica* and *The Cloud of Unknowing*, and found that these ancient mystical works concerned precisely the experience I had had, the life I had entered. So also, in lesser degree, of other old-time mystical writers whose works I had read before the experience and had thought I understood, especially *The Spiritual Guide* by Molinos; reading them now I perceived that this experience was the center and substance of what they wrote of, and now for the first time I understood them. It is what St. Paul is speaking of when he prays that his hearers "may be strong to apprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length

and height and depth—and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye may be filled unto all the fulness of God."

The experience is immediate perception of God and also immediate knowledge of God through that perception. The perception is unlike any other. Other perception looks either outward through the senses, or inward through self-consciousness; and reveals on the one hand the environment; on the other, the self. This is neither outward nor inward looking; you can simply say, it is other looking; and it reveals that which one sees as wholly other than either environment or self, and wholly independent of both. And as the perception is unlike any other perception, so the knowledge that the perception brings is unlike any other knowledge.

I suppose we may not say that finite mind is capable of having absolute knowledge; but this surely seems like absolute knowledge. Certainly there is no space nor crack nor cranny left—nor any possible—for doubt or question or uncertainty; neither is there disappearing or paling or diminution, no "gnawing tooth of time," for that which is given in this first wonderful perception is given once for all and for always.

You cannot, of course, do anything to impart to another a kind of knowledge different from any knowledge which the other possesses. But, perhaps, you can make another long for it, believe in its possibility and supreme value, and press on to attain it. You can simply say, I know God and I know Love; and I know God and Love in such a way that all other knowledge by comparison is pale and unreal, is weak and uncertain, is impotent, puny, and ineffective; I know them in such a way that I have to count this the only real knowledge I possess. As for the modern teaching that knowledge comes through the scientific method, this knowledge makes that teaching ludic-

rous. I have no desire to decry the practical value of science and the scientific method; but they don't give knowledge. They deal with the outside of things and of things that are outside us—separated by a double impassable wall from knowledge. This other perception granted to the soul is immediate knowledge of the inward being of all thing and of all selves, of that in which all things and selves consist—Love, God.

So transcendently significant, so absolute in its domination of the soul from the first moment is this other knowledge, that one derives from it the true definition of the soul. The soul is a finite consciousness with the capacity —usually latent—for perceiving and knowing the Infinite. Huxley's teaching, representative of the position of modern science, is this: Only that is knowledge which is given through the senses by the way of the scientific method. The truth is: Only that is knowledge which is given to the soul independently of the senses through its faculty for immediately perceiving God.

I wish I could make anywhere nearly adequate the representation of the certainty, the constancy, the transforming reality of this perception, this knowledge of Love. It comes in a moment—it is never for a moment lost; it is a gift from outside you—nothing can ever root it from your inmost being. Always it is there; always awaiting the turn of your thought towards it; always your Real in the midst of whatever distractions or confusion. Always it is beyond doubt of question, by nature not subject to doubt or question. It is with you, it is of you, it possesses you—you know it. You so know it, so it possesses you, that you glory in it and rest in it, you loudly exult in it and silently delight in it; it is your house of peace and your tide of power; you fall down and worship it in awe and trembling, and hug it to your bosom in intimate sweet intercourse; you see yourself as nothing and less than nothing

before its beauty and holiness, and of infinite worth because IT LOVES YOU; it answers all your questions, it is itself the object of your unending search and questioning.

The first fruit of this knowing of Love is peace—the peace that passes understanding; peace so deep, so wonderful, you are sure that nothing in heaven, earth, or hell can ever break it for a moment. Later, it appears that it can be broken—for a moment; but it comes flooding back again—how quickly and surely!—as you take refuge in the Presence; and you learn so to abide that that peace can most rarely and hardly and but on the surface be for a moment disturbed.

The second fruit you note is love flowing out from your heart. People, children especially, are so beautiful seen in the radiance of that Love, that you cannot help loving them, and you want to bring to them its choicest, holiest gifts; you want to help and serve and do—it is joy to be made lowly in humblest service to the lowliest objects of that Love.

And the third fruit is the ending of fear. Fear and apprehension have gone—that is all. How can you fear when you know Love that way? Know Love as the Reality; know Love with knowledge such that it stands in your mind as the one thing you know. Of course, you cannot fear; "perfect love casteth out fear"—and the whole passage, "God is Love," in St. John's epistle glows at last with its true light and meaning, and glows the brighter every time you read it. "Perfect love casteth out fear"; you have not to combat fear—any fear whatever; it isn't there, it ceases to be where the soul knows Love—knows Love with compelling knowledge. Perfect Love known in this way casts out fear not only for one's self, but just as completely for one's loved ones. You cannot fear for them after you have seen Love to be the

heart of every situation, the one controlling power everywhere, always holding every combination of circumstances perfectly in its grasp, and know that that Love cannot be escaped.

For one part of your new knowledge is that Love is perfect power. You do not see why Love is known to you now as manifestly, self-evidently almighty, determining everything after the counsel of its own will, power which cannot be thwarted, cannot be halted, cannot be opposed. Its self-manifestation came not in terms of power, but of gentleness and peace, and surely you see just as much as ever in the world about that seems Love's effective contradiction and nullification. For all that, not knowing how you know, yet you know that all power resides with Love, that Love has its perfect work, perfectly pursues its way and fulfills its will, absolutely orders the world about you —and there you rest. Not to rest there were to dishonor that Love. So you rest there, you cannot help but rest there—for yourself and for your loved ones. Sickness and the imminence of death cannot break your peace; sickness and death are in Love's hands. The grievous ills of society, the strife of classes, the selfishness of human hearts make you sad, but cannot make you question Love. To that Love, as you have seen it and know it, these are not problems, they are incidents—incidents in God's long, thorough school of love. The war might appall and oppress—with our finite vision it must; but it could not negative Love. If Love must lead the Son of God to Calvary, and through His Calvary found its supreme opportunity, may it not lead humanity to its Calvary—and in the fruits of that Calvary be justified as Love?

Yes, having caught the vision of Love you know that Love is vaster—infinitely vaster—than the war, deeper than human suffering, more real than sin. And right through the war and its horror and wickedness you rest

in that; and spite of sorrow and heart-ache and tragedy and lowering disaster, are at peace—peace that the world cannot give, and that the world cannot destroy.

Even your own sinfulness—of which you must often be made conscious by this holy Love—cannot disturb that peace. For one marvellous part of the marvellous knowledge newly come to you is that Love with its perfect power possesses you, possesses you wholly, to do with you just what Love will. And when those things within you that are contrary to perfect Love uplift their heads—as every now and again one does—you can simply and naturally and with perfect peace turn to Love and say: "Love, I belong to Thee, Thou possessest me; take care of this within me that is not of Thee"; and you give it no further thought. To give it further thought would be to distrust and so to dishonor that Love, to deny its absolute sufficiency for you; and there is now for you one terrible, deadly, utterly awful sin above all others—that is, not to trust, not to respond to, not to be yielded and wholly belong to, that Love.

That that Love—the Love that is infinite God—possesses you and you belong to it, that you possess infinite Love and it belongs to you—how incomparably divine a truth is that, to know every moment, to carry around with you into this work-a-day world, cleansing and exalting every instant of living, making life itself divine; filling it with quiet joy, with richest meaning, with unspeakable hope and confidence and peace! I want to speak of one special way in which this "peace of God" came to me. You know the pain that pierces through one's joy in looking at a scene of loveliness in nature, or upon a rarely beautiful face or a supreme work of art, or in listening to heavenly music. For a long time this pain had found expression with me—when the deeps of my soul were stirred by beauty—in the prayer, "God make me one with

that beauty, all of me; all of me, one with that beauty!" Do you know, after Love was revealed to me and took possession of me I never felt that pain again; and amidst all the ravishing beauty of these wonderful mountains that thrill my soul newly every day I find myself saying: "I thank Thee; I thank Thee, O Love, Thou hast made me one with thy beauty." And in every scene of beauty my eyes rest upon I see Love—the Love I know, the Love that has taken possession of my being—pulsating, thrilling, winging in waves of radiant glory from the gorgeous sunset, or the distant purple mountains, or the quivering aspen trees, or the far-spreading misty plains, to my heart and to the hearts of all who will see, and I am one with it all, and there is no pain but peace.

I pray two prayers now, and only two; the first, "God, forgive me," when I am aware, as I constantly have to be, how far I am from what Love is; the second, "Love, be Thou God, be Thou very God, in my life and in the world." And this I pray when I feel how the world waits and suffers for the revealing of Love, for the manifestation of Love's power, for the knowing of Love as the ultimate Real, as the Infinite, as God. And having seen Love as Love is and Love's almightiness, I know that in its own time and way it is to work mighty transformations in the hearts of men, in the social fabric, in the natural order, by virtue of its power in holy personalities. And when I pray this second prayer, I mean the furthering of all that, Love's blessed glorious work and power, in and through my life and all lives.

Only Love itself can do this work. He does it through us when we rest, rest absolutely, in Him. Strenuosity is of no avail; restless eager activity and striving to accomplish does not one thing. Toil that is not largely prayer and wholly prayer-inspired only hinders the coming of the Kingdom, creates only piles of debris where should be

rising the lovely graceful columns of Love's Temple—the Kingdom and Temple wrought of the hearts of men. This is the "quietism" of all the great mystics, of whom Miguel de Molinos, the Spaniard, was one. He especially is often charged with teaching a do-nothing doctrine. How utterly unlike his real teaching: "Do nothing but what God does through you!"

When God would work His works through us He can do it not at all without our wills, but only with the completest, most dynamic co-operation of our wills. That comes by waiting long—waiting long—through severest testing of our faith, upon Him, and doing that and only that which He moves us to do.

And how far Molinos' own life was from do-nothingness! He all but reformed the Church of Rome from within. The heart and core of his teaching is in these words: "Why, thinkest thou, do an infinite number of souls hinder the abundant current of the divine gifts? It is only because they would be doing something and have a desire to be great." Does the world need anything else but "the abundant current of the divine gifts"—the outpoured, all-o'ertopping flood of Love, and Love's power working Love's work in all our lives and through all our lives over all the world? And what prevents that is the restless striving of our wills to do, to accomplish, the craving of our hearts for note, recognition, distinction, achievement, instead of resting our wills and quelling all their striving in the knowing and loving of Love, and humbling our hearts in the beauty and perfectness and all-sufficiency of Love's all-embracing purpose and almighty power. When the will rests quietly there, when the heart bows lowly there, then almighty Love can work—work as He ever waits to work through the poised, reposeful, waiting will, through the lowly, humble, unselfed heart.

This will that is absolutely poised and balanced, able

to receive impulsions from the slightest motions of the Divine Will, comes only with the death of desire. The natural man will say at once, I don't want to desire to die. What were there to live for, where were any motive for going on and doing, even for thinking or existing, if desire has departed from life? Those were precisely the things I said to myself and keenly felt when I passed through the dying of desire.

Right here lies the great difference and measureless superiority of the Christian religion to the other great mystical religions. For the Buddhist, the death of desire means the final disappearance of the individual will in will-less, motive-less, purpose-less Being—Nirvana. For the Hindu Contemplative, it means complete withdrawal and separation from the finite, the mundane, the submerging of all personal relations in complete identification with the Absolute. The miracle of the Christian way is that it preserves, completes and fulfills the individual will in richest human relationships, with the putting off of self—of limited and personal desires and motives, and the putting on of Christ—the universal, world-embracing motive. The dying of desire is this universalizing of the will—escape from self, identification with the will of Christ; and "if the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." And the death of desire, though at first it may appall, means not at all the removal of motive from life, nor the paralysis of will, nor the absence of life's satisfactions. It means the mightiest motive possible—the motive of universal love; it means the completest possible activity of the will—working together with God; it means the one and only achievement that satisfies the soul—deep, true, redemptive relations with as many human souls as one can touch.

All Christian mystics tell us we have attained in the life of the spirit only when we love God not for what He

does for us, not for the ineffable promise there is for us in His love, but simply and wholly for what He is. I never understood this, nor saw how it was possible until Love stood self-revealed before the eye of my soul. Then I saw that Love is so altogether lovely, is of such infinite worth, so utterly to be desired, just because it is what it is, that the soul that sees it forthwith flows out towards it—it could not do other; it cannot help but love what it sees; with all your being you are in love with Love. That is what the saints mean, saying we must come to the point of loving God solely for what He is. It is profoundly true. It is this also that Jesus means in the words: "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." These words are the great foundation and justification of Christian mysticism.

I wonder whether what I have said of infinite and perfect Love self-revealed to the soul at all makes plain the truth that it all depends on and flows from the understanding of God that has come through the Incarnation—God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the Holy Trinity of Love.

The Spirit that was Jesus is the source and ground of Being; that is, Love itself is the Absolute and Infinite—which is what we mean by "God, the Father." But this love is not absolute in the sense of being unrelated and remote; it is being daily manifested and fulfilled in the facts and laws and processes of the actual world; the creation is Love's self-expression; the creation is Love in operation—that is what "God, the Son," the "Eternal Word," incarnate in Jesus, means. This Love in operation finds its supreme opportunity and medium of expression in the hearts of men; human beings are made to be Love's temple; and when a human life comes to its true being it has perceived and knows Absolute Love, is pos-

sessed by that Love in complete surrender, and that Love makes him one Body with all who own that Love in the following of Christ, and a debtor to all whom that Love loves in a debt beyond anything he can ever repay—this is God, the Holy Ghost.

I am sure you will have said to yourself, What a wonderful, what a surpassing life must that life be to which Divine Love has been revealed—meaning the character not only of that life's inward consciousness, but of its outward fruits. My only answer can be, That shall be as Love wills. Love wills, we know, that love shall be made manifest and become mighty in utmost degree over all the world to all ages for our entire humanity. Into that perfect purpose the one to whom the superlative revelation has been granted is by that revelation fitted, while always the outworking of that purpose as it may affect his life and its fruits are beyond his knowing.

What it means for the inward life I know—perfect peace. For the outward life I know it means that in Love's time and way Love shall be mightily revealed through that life. But I conceive that Love's time and way for that mighty revealing may perfectly well be in some future existence, for which all this experience is preparation—and with that, if that be Love's plan, I am most content.

Always faithfully yours,

H.

Religious Education

Rev. G. Ashton Oldham

TRUE education—by whatever name it is called—has but a single aim, viz., the development of the individual in right relation to his environment. Secular education deals with only part of this environment—nature and man. It therefore needs to be supplemented by the development of right relations with that other part of every soul's environment which we call God.

Religious education aims at training in righteousness. But that, after all, is nothing other than old-fashioned and common "rightness," which comprehends right relations with man and right relations with God. Thus understood religious education is the only complete education, the only education which aims at developing the whole nature in correspondence to the whole environment.

Our public schools are unable to deal adequately, if at all, with the child's relation to God. Whether this is a good or bad thing is of no concern just now. The chances are that in this country it never will be changed; and even if it should be, we must deal with the present situation as it is. The public schools do not teach religion, and therefore if our children's education is to be complete some agency must. This is both the manifest duty and opportunity of the Church. Both for its own well-being and for the welfare of the state and, indeed, our whole present day civilization and culture, the Church must betake itself earnestly to this task. It is its most important and imperative duty.

Secular education alone is and always has been a failure, due in large measure to its limited aim and scope. Of this we have abundant instances—ancient and modern. The Spartans of old were trained only in their duties to the state, and Sparta became a despotic socialism. Edu-

cation for the Athenians included the arts of music and literature as well as patriotism, but because it omitted the appeal to the conscience, which only religion can supply, the Athenians became a nation of refined liars, so that "the liars of Athens" became a familiar proverb.

The striking modern illustration is, of course, Germany. Here was a nation the most highly trained in science, art and industry, and yet because religiously it had substituted the valor of Valhalla for the meekness of the Nazarene it produced a civilization without a soul and became a menace to mankind. It was the Duke of Wellington who once said: "Education without religion will surround us with clever devils," and few will deny that the Germans were clever or that many of their deeds and aims were devilish.

Of course, these are not the only instances, but they are the most striking and they serve to illustrate the truth that so-called "secular education" alone is woefully inadequate, if not positively dangerous. The field of knowledge is now so wide and modern man is in possession of such gigantic forces that unless these are controlled and directed by religious and moral sanctions all our vast knowledge may prove a curse rather than a blessing. Just at present the world is hovering on the edge of a volcano. It is not yet apparent whether our modern knowledge will usher in the new Jerusalem, or whether it will result in the annihilation of the civilization and culture which is the product of the centuries. Great powers can only safely be entrusted to good men. Consequently, the greater our advance in knowledge, the more thorough our secular education, the greater is the need of religious education.

Benjamin Kidd has well said: "Physics, with chemistry helping, gave us the submarine assassin; chemistry, murderous gases, and biology furnished germs to poison man

and beast . . . yet these things, devilish as the uses to which they were put, were not in themselves necessarily evil; the anthrax germ might have been used as are anti-toxin; the murderous gases to destroy vermin, and the submarine even to transport missionaries." Increased knowledge and enlarged powers can only be to our advantage, or even our safety, if along with them goes greater moral and spiritual development. Man must increase not only in wisdom, but also "in favor with God and man."

Let us now turn for a few moments to our own country. Is all well here? It needs no pessimist, but only one with eyes open to see the danger clouds on the horizon. Selfishness, materialism, profiteering, slacking, anarchy in high circles as in low, and a general laxness in conduct and morals are evident on every hand. Although much of this is an inevitable reaction from our state of moral and spiritual exaltation of a few years ago, and while it is serious, it is, nevertheless, in large measure but a temporary moral lapse. On the other hand, we shall not be able to tread the upward path of return without some effort. This moral lapse has a deeper cause than mere reaction, and if it is to be overcome we must betake ourselves seriously and energetically to the task.

The fact is that America is by no means completely a Christian nation. Originally it was, and technically perhaps it still is; but as respects the actions and attitudes of its members today it can more accurately be defined as pagan. For the essence of paganism is not the worshipping of other gods, but the living for this world only. Is not that what vast multitudes in this country are doing today? The reason for this is perfectly evident when we consider the religious situation as shown by official statistics. There we find that five and one-half millions of our people are still illiterate. Twenty-eight and one-half

millions under 25 years of age have no relation whatever to any Sunday School or Church. Fifty-eight millions altogether are absolutely untouched by the Christian Church. In other words, less than fifty per cent of our population is even nominally Christian, and in some of our western states—Oklahoma, for example—fully eighty per cent is untouched by any religious association. To judge by numbers then, America is pagan, and unless the present trend is checked and reversed it will not be long before pagan ideals predominate.

Indeed, pagan ideals already dominate a large section of our country and a goodly portion of our best educated and most cultured people. One particular phase of this—the absence of the restraints of a previous generation in the amusements of the young today—has been discussed in several recent issues of the *Atlantic Monthly*. In last August's number, Mrs. Katherine Fullerton Gerould put her finger unerringly upon the root cause. After allowing for various causes such as the war, the automobile, carelessness of fathers and mothers, she goes on to say truly: "The abandonment of religion is probably most responsible of all, since it bears a casual relation to most of these other facts. When we had religion, we may have been vulgar, but our vulgarity was not so vital. The type of religion by which we were for the most part influenced in America did not necessarily give us manners, but it did necessarily give us morals. It called certain things sins; it stuck to the Ten Commandments. It forbade exploitation of the senses. Perhaps it forbade too much. That is not for me to say. By objecting to all music, to all dancing, to all plays, to most fiction, to a hundred forms of art and beauty, it brought about—you may believe—an inevitable and legitimate revolt. No one, I have heard it said, is gayer than the Quaker turned 'worldly.' But the fact remains that when, as a social group, we

threw over religion, we threw over—probably without meaning to—most of our every-day moral sanctions.

"Many of my friends are not religious at all, although they are moral. But they were nearly all brought up in strict religious forms; and while their brains have discarded dogma, their characters have none the less been moulded by a fairly firm Christian ethic. Whether they will be able to pass that ethic on to their children, without the dogma, remains, most interestingly, to be seen. At present what they cling to most, I find, is the recognized social code, which itself was built up largely by the Christian ethic. But social conditions in a modern democracy change so rapidly that a code with no eternal sanction is a weak reed to lean upon. We are enduring more and more in America the influence of people who have broken deliberately or violently with any religious law; and you cannot knock away the props and still keep the structure. You cannot make the Ten Commandments potent by mere dwelling on their inherent felicity. If there is no divine command back of them they lose all power over the man who finds it more satisfactory to break them. . . . For better or worse, our western civilization has been built up on the Christian religion; and if the Christian religion decays many accidents will happen that will puzzle the politicians."

All of these "signs of the times" warrant serious reflection, and should result in energetic action. The difficulties admittedly are great, but so is the opportunity. What should be our plan of action? How and where shall we begin? After the battle of Sedan, when the great German General Von Moltke was riding in triumph to Paris, he is reported to have said: "It is the Prussian schoolmaster who should be given the credit for this." Wellington has also told us that the Battle of Waterloo was won on the fields of Eton and Rugby. The recent war was, on Ger-

many's part, the result of a comprehensive plan of education carried out with typical German thoroughness, and, similarly, the splendid victories and the crusader spirit of our American soldiers was the result of their training in American ideals of liberty in the public schools, and Christian ideals of service and sacrifice in the Sunday Schools and Churches of the land. Not a church or mission chapel but had its honor roll, and scarce one which has not some blue stars turned to gold.

Another striking example of the fruits of education is to be found in the Far East. Not many years ago a writer produced a book entitled "The Unchanging East," but the ink was scarcely dry before his entire thesis was disproved. Within the past two decades changes have come over India, Egypt, China, and notably Japan, such as have taken centuries in the west. Says Mr. Benjamin Kidd, in "The Science of Power": "Within the space of less than two generations, Japan has passed through the whole interval which separates feudalism from modern conditions. In this space of time a change in general habits, in social and mental outlook, and in national consciousness was accomplished as by the wand of a conjuror."

How have all these vast changes been accomplished? Simply by education. Without doubt, education is the greatest power in shaping national life, and upon the kind of education we give depends the nature and quality of national character. Professor Norman E. Richardson says: "The objects of these Prussian and Japanese educators have not been ideal from the Christian point of view. But the methods which they have devised to accomplish their ends awaken our profound respect. If the educators of America should agree to use similar means, in less than two generations they could permeate our nation with the pure religion of the Son of God as effectively as

Germany became permeated with militarism or Japan with the scientific spirit."

But where shall we begin? The answer again is clear. Little can be done with the older folk. It is difficult for the leopard to change his spots. We must begin with the young.

The future is with the young, and what multitudes they are! The first draft disclosed about twelve million young men in this country, and the second draft many more. These are the men who are to become leaders in business and the professions and rulers in our Government within a short time. They are the ones who will shape our future institutions. Below them are many millions of boys and girls growing up to take their places, and it is not too much to say that the activities of these young persons will shape our institutions and direct the destinies of this land for possibly centuries to come. How heavy then our responsibility and how equally great our opportunity!

Somehow we must see to it that these young persons grow not only in stature and wisdom, but in favor with God and man. They must not only have every facility for developing splendid bodies and alert and well-stored minds, but they must also learn how to use these bodies and minds for the welfare of their fellowmen and the glory of God. Nothing less than this will suffice.

Moreover, we must begin with the very young. Educators assert that the first seven or eight years of a child's life determine whether he is to be religious or not. And if a child passes the age of adolescence—about twelve—without having been touched by religion, the chances are against his ever being influenced by it. It would seem clear, then, that the Church's chief task is really with the little ones who received so much of our Lord's atten-

tion and whom He commanded should be allowed to come to Him.

If for a decade or a generation the Church, if it cannot perform both tasks, were to neglect or even abandon much of its work for adults and address itself with all its powers and resources to training the coming generation, both the Church and the world would profit in the end. Here is the greatest missionary field in the world, and it is already ripe unto the harvest. Others see this, if we do not, and are already taking advantage of it. The Socialist schools, the "Red" Sunday Schools, the schools of every cult and ism are striking evidences of the wisdom of many of their adherents. Can the Church of God do less? Here is the place for Christian laymen to expend their millions if they would secure the largest possible returns, and here is the place for the Church to expend her time, her energy and her prayers if she would reap an abundant harvest.

The story is told of an old Roman General who lay dying. He loved Rome and had labored and fought for her all his life long. Now he was perplexed as to her future. Then his colleagues endeavor to console him. They say: "We are brave; we love Rome; we will defend Rome." But the old man seeing that their time too is short remains unconsoled. Then come his warriors who say likewise: "We are brave; we love Rome; we will defend Rome." Again he tells them that they too are mortal and that ere long their day will cease. Then come the young men and repeat the same words. But still he is oppressed with the thought of the mortality of man and derives little consolation or hope. Then comes a band of the youth of the city, saying: "We are brave; we love Rome; we will defend Rome." More hopeful now he deigns to smile and commend them, but still he cannot get out of his mind the thought of their departure, and wonders what will happen to his beloved Rome then. At last

comes a group of little children from the streets of the city—children who have caught the patriotic spirit of their elders and who voice their sentiments in their own words: "We are brave; we love Rome; we will defend Rome" they cry; and at that exhibition of the eternal childhood of the race tears of joy start from the old man's eyes, and with a shout of relief and confidence he cries: "Rome is safe; I go in peace."

The Gift of Ghostly Strength

Rev Frank H. Hallock

THE last of the Gifts of which we have to think stands in some such relation to all the others that a man's spine stands to his physical being. Strength is needed for the development of Wisdom and Understanding, Knowledge and Counsel cannot reach perfection apart from it; without Strength Holy Fear becomes mere timidity and cowardice, earthly fear; Piety without Strength degenerates into emotion, weakness. To sustain the other Gifts which belong to the will—Holy Fear and Piety, Strength is vitally necessary for it gives them character, courage, endurance. It is this Strength that we ask when we pray that we may have "grace and power faithfully to fulfill" those things which, by the enlightenment of our minds, we "perceive and know" as the things which we "ought to do."[1]

"By ghostly strength we are morally courageous and persevere in grace and self-discipline."[2] "The spirit of Ghostly Strength makes us strong to overcome the evil within, resist temptation, and bravely witness for Christ."[3]

---

[1]Collect First Epiphany.
[2]Dr. F. J. Hall, Theological Outlines, Vol. 3, p. 60.
[3]Bp. Grafton, A Catholic Atlas, p. 113.

"It gives us courage to undertake great things for God, and to carry them through, and to suffer for Him."[4] It may be called *par excellence* the Gift of Confirmation; multitudes lack the natural mental endowment upon which the Holy Spirit may operate supernaturally, many are given few opportunities for the development of some of the Gifts, but Ghostly Strength is needed in the daily life of everyone.

We need to realize the power of God the Holy Ghost more than we do ordinarily, as God He is almighty, able to do all things, as He is given us we are endowed with power to do all things that are required of us in the moral and spiritual spheres, just as Samson was endowed with a superhuman physical strength when "the Spirit of the Lord came upon him." "Greater is He that is in us than he that is in the world"[5]; the certainty of this Presence, the conviction of this Strength that has been imparted to us enables us to say with St. Paul, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me."[6] This Strength supernaturally endows the Cardinal Virtue of Fortitude and enables us to resist all temptations to the Deadly Sin of Sloth, physical, mental, moral, spiritual. Fortitude only enables a man to do and to endure up to the capacity of his own power; Ghostly Strength moves us to the "heroic" acts and sufferings of the true "superman." But the Holy Spirit does not compel us, He acts in conjunction with our will, He makes us strong when we look to Him for needed strength, just as He strengthened the Apostles at Pentecost.

In our Lord there was never a sign of weakness, the Divine Gift enabled Him to triumph in the wilderness, to put aside the suggestion of the flesh when it caused Him

[4]Rev. W. H. Hutchings, Person and Work of the Holy Ghost, p. 244. Dionysius the Carthusian says: "Fortitudo est habitus supernaturalis atque infusus, secundum principia fidei divinaeque legis agens et patiens."
[5]I St. John 4:4.
[6]Phil. 4:13.

to shrink from the cup, to bear the agony of the Cross. But deeper than this was the inward strength which enabled Him to bear up in a world where sin was prevalent on all sides and never lose the vision of victory over its power. Actively the fruits of this Gift appear in the splendid daring of the Lion of the tribe of Judah, in His "self-assertion"—"I and the Father are one," "Before Abraham was I am;" in His replacement of the established customs and traditions—the Sabbath, divorce—by the teachings which were in accord with the eternal purpose of God. In pictures of our Lord, in hymns, in devotional writings, His strength often falls in the background, and we do not grasp the paradoxical combination of the Strength of His Manhood with the tenderness that we ordinarily associate with the feminine.

In the Church the Spirit of Strength has operated primarily in the production of "the noble army of Martyrs;" it made them invincible in the face of tortures of which we can hardly bear to read, its fruits appear in the lives of SS. Ignatius, Polycarp, Cyprian, Lawrence, etc., in the stories of the Jesuit activities in our land as we read them in Parkman's history.

It is not extinct in our age, for we have martyrs in deed as well as in will in the mission field, to say nothing of those who in our parish Churches at home suffer daily things which are, perhaps, harder to bear than physical torture or death would be. All these win their victories in the power of Ghostly Strength. It may be that the martyr spirit has not gone from us as we sometimes think; some years ago a work of fiction told of a party of French travellers crossing the desert, set upon and overpowered by a company of Mahommetan fanatics, and given the old Moslem choice of apostasy or death. They were in no wise remarkable for their religious zeal, just a group of ordinary men travelling in a dangerous place whither

their occupation had brought them; but, one after another, as he was given the chance to decide, replied "Je suis chrétien; j'y reste." True, this was only a story, but it is not hard for us to conceive it as a reality. What would you do if the same choice were offered you?

Then the Church has in every age needed the Spirit of Ghostly Strength to enable it to continue in missionary effort when the rewards seemed so wholly out of proportion to the expenditure; but this Spirit gives it fortitude to persevere until "the kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord, and of His Christ: and He shall reign for ever and ever."[7] It is incessantly needed also in the struggle to preserve the Church's faith and morals, "once delivered to the saints," and handed down as a sacred deposit which every age is called upon to guard and to pass unchanged, save by legitimate development which comes of use and thought, to the next. Remember that the contemptous sarcasm of the apostate Julian was as dangerous to the Church as the violence of Galerius, and that incalculable harm is done the Church today by the light-speaking disregard which we, her children and defenders, lack the courage begotten of Ghostly Strength to resist.

In relation to ourselves this Gift operates in a two-fold direction: actively, so that we may do the things that we are called upon to do, and passively, so that we may bear the things we are called upon to endure,—perhaps there is even greater need of the latter. There is no time when we do not need this Strength, but let us think of some occasions when the need is especially apparent.

1. In temptation; the devil with all his cunning and knowledge of human nature (other Gifts have taught us not to underestimate his power) is foredoomed to failure when we face him in the Strength of the Holy Spirit. When

[7]Rev. XI:15.

our enemy is directing his utmost power against us we hear the words which strengthened St. Paul and brought comfort to poor John Bunyan in his struggles, "My grace is sufficient for thee."[8] In the midst of the fiery furnace of temptation there is One who walks with us, even as He walked with Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego, and gives us Strength to endure and to resist. Our victory is inevitable, for "They that be with us are more than they that be with them"[9] and we are "strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man."[10] We may enter the combat daily confident of this victory, for "There hath no temptation overtaken you but such as is common to man."[11] Temptations serve their purpose in God's economy as they make us more sensible of our weakness and of our need of Ghostly Strength.

2. In afflictions of every sort this Gift enables us to bear uncomplainingly whatever comes with confidence and patience such as Job possessed, "Though He slay me yet will I trust Him." Convinced with St. Teresa "that all is right that seems most wrong if it be His dear will." How often does one find this Strength among the most sorely afflicted! And without it how hard life with its almost inevitable trials becomes!

3. In self-discipline, fasting, almsgiving, whatever form it may take, how should we persevere without this Strength? And persevere we must, for we can never look forward to a time here when self-discipline will not be necessary. "He that putteth his hand to the plow and looketh back is not fit for the kingdom of heaven."[12] How many wives has Lot in our present-day churches, monuments, spiritually inanimate, of failure to persevere? They have forgotten that there can be no end here of the warfare unto which they were called, no time when the armor of discipline may safely be laid aside, that he only

[8]2 Cor. 12:9. [9]2 Kings 6:17. [10]Eph. 3:16. [11]I Cor. 10:13. [12]St. Lk. 9:62.

"that shall endure to the end shall be saved."[13] In these days of spiritual softness, due to the disregard of the means whereby we keep our nature and bring it into subjection, there is much need of preaching the Spirit of Ghostly Strength.

4. For perseverence, just to go on from day to day, when all the established devotions become tiresome, monotonous, in short, an utter bore, and in our state of "dryness" we find no sweetness or freshening of spiritual life in our approaches to our Lord. When He seems to have withdrawn Himself and our efforts to communicate with Him are as fruitless as an attempt to use a telephone when the line is "dead," we speak into the receiver but no voice answers. Our apparent failure causes us to lapse, all too often, into a spiritual slovenliness, to hate the effort of the will needed for devotion, to become mechanical, indifferent and negligent. When we pass through what St. John of the Cross calls "the obscure night," "the dark night of the soul," what Fr. Baker terms the "great desolation;" then, if ever, we need Strength to keep us from surrender to the enemy, to enable this state to bear its fruits in a purification of love which expels all that is unworthy and self-seeking and makes us love God for Himself, not for His rewards, temporal or spiritual. One finds a certain confusion, a perplexity, a bewilderment, among those who should know better; many who do not seek temporal rewards from their service of God, who are altogether too well taught for that, are yet deeply aggrieved, feel oftentimes as though they had been deprived of something to which they were justly entitled, when there is no sensible Presence of God as they make their devotions. While they should be brought to a better understanding ultimately, they will need meanwhile the Spirit of Strength that they may persevere until they

[13]St. Mt. 24:13.

learn that He has only withdrawn the consciousness of His Presence for a time that their faith may be tested, and that they may have the greater joy in finding Him again, "closer than breathing, nearer than hands and feet."

5. In witness bearing. "Marvel not, my brethren, if the world hate you,"[14] there is abundant material for wholesome self-examination in these words, remembering what St. James has said, that "whosoever would be a friend of the world maketh himself an enemy of God."[15] Is there any reason why the world should hate us? It would if we were faithful in bearing witness for our Church, its faith, its moral message, just as it hated the early Christians for their faithfulness in choosing a "more excellent way" and by their example shaming those amongst whom they lived. Has the world ever brought the weapon of accusation against us as it did against our Lord when it called Him "gluttonous and a wine bibber,"[16] against Him "who endured grief, suffering wrongfully?"[17] Think of the charges of unchastity, disloyalty, false witness which it brought against St. Athanasius for thirty long years. In more recent times think of Dr. Neale, of Dr. Pusey as he bore so long the charge of treason to his Church, of the innumerable company of whom the world was not worthy and against whom it has used one of its favorite weapons, while they committed their cause to God, seeking no justification in the eyes of men and awaiting His vindication. These souls who have borne their witness faithfully bear wounds which will be their everlasting glory in heaven. Ghostly Strength enables us, too, to bear our witness as we follow the way which Wisdom and Counsel point out, the way which is opposed to compromises that we excuse on the ground of expediency. We

---

[14] I St. John 3:13, cf. St. Mt. 24:9.
[15] St. Jas. 4:4. [16] St. Mt. XI:19. [17] I St. Peter 2:19.

are weak naturally and the way of compromise is easy, but remember what changes were wrought in the lives of the Apostles when the Holy Spirit came upon them. The day will never come until this world passes away in which a constant supply of recruits will not be needed to fill up the ranks of the "noble army of martyrs" and maintain the record of their victories in the past. Most of us in our witness bearing would be martyrs of the commonplace, but our martyrdom is no less real, no less necessary, than that of those who suffered persecution, torture, death, for the Faith in the days that are gone by.

Letters From a Layman, IV.

DEAR FATHER J—

. . . The trouble goes back to the dearth of education, and this implies the failure of the Church to make teaching a standard practice in every parish. If one of those "surveys" should be made, how large a multitude of priests would the totals show as preaching their people the Prayer Book?

What started me thinking about this was a Boston churchwoman telling me last Sunday that the difference between the Catholic "party" and the "rest" of the Church lies in the confession. The "rest" of the Church, she pointed out, does not believe in, nor practice, nor permit confession, nor its scarlet sister absolution.

"Have you ever heard the long exhortation," in which those whose consciences trouble them are urged to open their grief to the priest?" She admitted that she had not.

We had to produce a Prayer Book from the library, and show her the passages before she could be convinced. I felt when it was over that the Prayer Book will never be the same to her again, but she had to admit that the word

"absolution" was actually there. "It had never occurred to me that way" she murmured.

I do not question that this lady was taught the catechism, any more than I doubt that the Rev. Percy Grant's foundling baby will also be taught it, but it seems to me that the catechism is not the whole Prayer Book. It is only a part, an essential one, of course, but as it stands, rough and stony going for the young knees that have to climb it without a guide who will point out to them what the scenery and the historic spots mean. I should like to know what the boys and girls really think about it, inside their silent little heads. And then, is anything more done about it for them after baptism and confirmation? Or once they have pased their examinations, are the pupils supposed to have been automatically promoted into a grade where all things are clear, where no questions need be asked or answered, and the department of education has become a closed door?

Does this promotion also close the Prayer Book for good? Is anything else left that will interest people in the practices of the church in America and the world outside? Do other professions stop like this and learn nothing beyond the rudiments which gave them their diplomas? Or can it be that the Prayer Book is not worth the trouble of teaching—that it is merely a prompt book for Sunday performances?

I did not ask the Boston lady who her rector is. I preferred to let him rest in peace, but the fact remains from the evidence that he has not told her where the confession and the absolution in the Communion office came from, and that they read identically the same today—except for the spelling—as they did in the year of Our Lord 1549, in the First Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth, in which the Lord's Supper and the Communion is "Commonly called the Masse." How many priests know of, and have

in their libraries, the Everyman's Edition of this prayer book, in the facsimile spelling? Has the Rev. Dr. Parks told his congregation that even the Encyclopedia Britannica contains an article on the Prayer Book? This article states that each revision of the Prayer Book from the first to ours has been in the direction of the Catholic faith and practice, but aside from this it is very good reading.

The story of the Communion Service—"Commonly called the Masse"—reflected against the whole history of the Church's liturgy from the times of the Apostles is a document also disturbing to Puritans, but full of interest to churchmen. The reason why our American liturgy differs from the Anglican rite, and is more ancient than either the Anglican or the Roman canons, is equally annoying, for it brings into the picture the sturdy figure of Bishop Seabury, of the free and independent commonwealth of Connecticut, knocking in vain before the gates of Canterbury, and at last kneeling before the Scottish bishops to receive at their hands the apostolic succession for America: a dramatic as well as an historic event, and 100 per cent Catholic!

Then the saints whose days the Church orders us to observe in the Kalendar of the Prayer Book—and the whole tapestry of the Church in England, and of its heroes—this is a human interest chronicle worth unrolling under the parish house lamps on winter nights, and a great opportunity for a priest or layman who has a gift for story telling. Indeed, the tale would make a moving picture of absorbing interest, although, alas, again a Catholic one.

Is anything of this sort done as a recognized part of church practice? I am seeking information as a layman who has found a wealth of interest for his simple mind and soul in such reading and study, and wonders in a childlike way why others should not share in the feast also. But it may be wrong and "dangerous" to think of

seeking the truth by teaching the people the Prayer Book and its story. The history of the Catholic church is wrapped around and woven into the fabric of the Prayer Book, and is bound up with it; and there are so many other things to think and talk about, from preaching in Methodist meeting houses to reading the scriptures in Jewish synagogues! All these are strictly up to date and readable, and I fear I am a back number. But I know a priest in a small and uneventful parish overtopped by waterfront factories who is doing these things which I am asking about. He has organized a parish house school, and his pupils, large and small, are for the most part only eighth graders in mental training. Yet at the 7 a. m. mass on Christmas morning A. D. 1920, 257 communicants knelt before the altar lights. What I want to know is whether or not this priest is wasting his time?

—N.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Gospels as Historical Documents: Part III, *The Fourth Gospel.* By Vincent Henry Stanton, D.D. Cambridge: University Press, 1920, pp. x+293.

Johannine Writings (Liverpool Diocesan Board of Divinity Publications, xix). By A. Nairne. London and New York: Longmans, 1918, pp. 114; paper.

Part I of Stanton's work appeared in 1903; Part II in 1909. It has been a long wait for Part III, but one which was worth while: the book is sufficient compensation for the delay.

Stanton's purpose in this volume is to ascertain whether the Fourth Gospel has or has not "a right to be treated as an independent historical witness alongside of the Synoptic Gospels, having drawbacks indeed in this character as they have, though largely different ones, but whose testimony cannot any more than theirs be disregarded." His conclusion affirms this right. As readers of Part I (p. 238) may have divined, St. John the Apostle, if he be not the *author* of the Fourth Gospel, is at least its

authority: "it may be that in our Fourth Gospel we have the teaching of St. John turned to account by the thought and labor of another mind, possibly one of larger grasp."

This younger man, "disciple" of the Apostle, was more than an amanuensis or stenographer, for he wrote the "First Epistle" of John. This was produced somewhat earlier than the Gospel, and "in the name of a group" (Part III, p. 83). "John the Presbyter" had nothing to do with either writing, though he may possibly be "the Elder" of Epp. II and III (p. 108).

Stanton does not recognize the various strata of authorship or of editorial reworking which Wendt and others have discovered in the Gospel. Its structure is, indeed, "somewhat looser than was commonly supposed before the analytical critics urged their views * * * but * * * in the main (*i.e.,* excepting the Appendix) the features of the Gospel are most consistent with the view that herein a great Christian teacher has put together what he had been accustomed to teach orally in divers parts, setting forth the whole in accordance with the grand outlines of his own conception of the Gospel" (p. 73).

The immediate source of the work was the oral tradition of a "Christian community in which it was customary not merely to repeat utterances of Christ, but to paraphrase them with a view to bringing out their meaning, and to combine fragments of His teaching which had been handed down separately, joining them together in such a way as to form longer and more continuous pieces" (p. 51). There was in this community, very likely, "one pre-eminent teacher * * * subsequently the fourth evangelist, who made it his practice to give instruction in this way, * * * who may himself have been the disciple of a revered teacher, who had done likewise, and whose reports and paraphrases of the sayings of Jesus he repeated and expanded."

The Gospel, then, is a cumulative product, the fruit of years of teaching and meditation. Its culmination is in the Prologue, which stands first, but, like most prologues and prefaces, was written, or ought logically to have been written, last. "We have the history of the evangelist's thought in inverse order. In the body of the Gospel we have matter which had accumulated during years of meditation and teaching; it contains statements of divine truth which he had inherited; it reflects Christological beliefs which he had held, modes of thought to which he had become accustomed, before he grasped the Logos-idea and applied it to the Person of Christ" (p. 178). It is noticeable that Stanton fails to give to St. Paul and his influence the place in this development which E. F. Scott, for example, has claimed.

The first part of Ch. VI, "The Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics," seems—at least to the present reviewer—not quite conclusive. Again and again the question arises, "If the author of the Fourth Gospel had the Gospel of Mark before him, why did he omit this and that—why did he not treat the writing seriously, instead of with fitful approval here, disapproval there, restatement of a sentence or two, but for the most part completely ignoring the earlier Gospel? What was his purpose—to supplement Mark, or supplant it? To correct it, or to take its place?" It appears indubitable that from time to time the fourth evangelist has the synoptic tradition in mind; but that is not quite the same as writing with the Roman Gospel unrolled across his knees.

This objection only makes the heartier our appreciation of the latter half of the chapter (p. 263ff) on "the Sayings of Jesus in Synoptics and Fourth Gospel on His Person and Mission." Indeed, here is the best part of Stanton's book. The words of Dr. Moffatt are verified:

> "The day is over * * * when the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptists could be played off against each other in a series of rigid antitheses, as though the one were a matter of fact and homogeneous chronicle and the other a spiritual reading of the earlier tradition. * * * Recent criticism has revealed the operation of tendencies which exercise a creative as well as a moulding pressure upon the tradition" (*Int. Lit. N. T.*, 540).

But these tendencies, according to Stanton, go back to the Synoptic Gospels—*i.e.*, to Jesus Himself. In these sayings, *viz.*, our Lord's sayings regarding His Person and Mission, rather than in the eschatological matter, "we are brought into contact with the living consciousness of Jesus—with revelation of His thoughts concerning His Mission from the Father to the world, and of the communion which His Spirit held with the Father. If our minds are not obsessed with the notion that in the Fourth Gospel throughout we have simply deductions from, and various restatements of, a philosophical theorem by a theologian of the second or later Christian generation, these sayings will, I believe, give us a strong impression of authenticity, and the comparison of sayings in the Synoptics will help to show that it is a right one" (p. 266f). The Fourth Gospel, then, is no philosophical romance, with even the most pious of purposes; but a natural, justifiable, in fact, inevitable development—under later conditions and in a different intellectual environment from that of Palestine in the first third of the century, or of the Synoptic Gospels in the last third. It represents the development of conceptions, and of the narration of experienced facts, which were present in the Gospel from the very

first. The Fourth Gospel does not belong outside the primal stream of doctrinal development, as an alien tributary, but in its very middle.

This is far more important a matter than apostolic authorship, if anyone is inclined to regret Stanton's failure to champion the traditional view.

Nairne's little volume of lectures is not designed to contribute to the solution of critical problems, but to apply the results of criticism to present day needs. The lectures were delivered during the war, and must have meant much to all who heard them in those troublous days. They mean much still. Take, for example, this, from page 75:

> "St. John no longer speaks of the Advent, the Coming. He speaks of the Lord being manifested. To St. Paul, as to his Jewish ancestors, the imaginative picture sufficed of the Lord coming as from a distant place. St. John thinks of Him as always and everywhere present, but as yet His presence is not known by all—He comes to his own and they receive Him not; and by none is it fully realized, for none are yet 'like Him.' But He shall be known, and the children shall be like Him. He shall be manifested. We shall see Him. Yet even that term 'see' is deepened to more than physical sight: we shall see Him 'as He is.'"

The work is an example of "devout criticism"—of the sort which would do no harm here in America, if only more of our clergy took the time for study which such work requires.

—Frederick C. Grant.

The Dramatic Associations of the Easter Sepulchre. By Karl Young. University of Wisconsin Studies. Madison, Wis., 1920, pp. 130.

Dr. Barry, one of our most gifted students of ritual, has laid down the principle that out of love for the Blessed Sacrament there has grown, spontaneously, a whole cycle of devotions connected with it. In like manner it would appear that love for the sacred body of Jesus Christ has spontaneously given to the Catholic Church a cycle of devotions that cluster about Maundy Thursday, Good Friday and Easter Day. And these devotions have been found in Rome, the Pope himself and his Cardinal Priests officiating at them; in the rest of Italy, in England, in France, in Switzerland, in Hungary, and in Germany. The earliest traces are found in the ninth century; and by the eleventh we have M. S. S. giving full rubrics for their observance.

These devotions are the *deposito,* the *elevatio* and the *visitatio.* At the Maundy Thursday mass three hosts are consecrated, one for the mass of the day, one for the mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday, and one for the *depositio.* After the mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday the host is "deposited" or "buried" in the "Sepulchre," which is either one of the tabernacles in the church, or the relic box under the altar, or a receptacle in the sacristy, with appropriate ceremonial. This is the *depositio,* and represents the burial of Christ's Body.

On Easter morning, before Matins, the host is taken from the "Sepulchre" and placed on the High Altar of the church, with appropriate ceremonial, either privately by priest or sacristan, or publicly in the presence of a congregation. This is the elevatio and represents the resurrection of Christ's Body from the tomb. On this follows the visitatio sepulchri, or visit to the empty sepulchre, with its ceremonial, this last service generally involving a more or less dramatic representation of the two Maries to the sepulchre. Sometimes this is combined with some representation of the "harrowing of Hell"; *i.e.,* the descent of Christ into Hades. Especially full and dramatic was this latter in the English Convent of Barking in the fourteenth century.

While this seems to have been the earliest cycle of devotions, two other cycles are noted. Thus the cross or crucifix, and in some instances the *Corpus,* detached from the crucifix, is deposited or buried in the "sepulchre" and elevated to the High Altar of the church, with appropriate ceremonial. This cycle of devotions is closely connected with the Adoration of the Cross on Good Friday. Finally, in some cases, both the host and the cross or *corpus* are deposited in the "sepulchre" on Good Friday and elevated to the High Altar of the church on Easter morning, of course with the appropriate ceremonial.

Some of these services are quite simple, and others are exceedingly elaborate. There is no uniformity, each diocese, aye, each convent, apparently having a use of its own. Nor is the logical sequence of the services always strictly observed. The author gives a large number of these devotions in the original ecclesiastical Latin, thus enabling the reader to study them for himself. And they are most interesting, breathing, as they do, the deepest love for and devotion to the Sacred Body of our Redeemer, and striving to realize His burial and His Resurrection.

It is delightful to find a layman so deeply interested in these old services as is Professor Young. He is to be congratulated on his excellent and valuable monograph, which is the fruit of careful and loving research.

F. C. H. W.

The Anglo-Catholic Congress Report. The Macmillan Co., 1920, pp. 207.

Not many years have passed since a group of Oxford professors issued a formidable work replete with the most modern theological sophistries. They labelled their work "Foundations"—a title sufficiently appellative to challenge refutation and defy the pretensions of orthodoxy. Most of us are aware of the controversies to which it immediately gave rise. "Foundations" held the field for a time, and except for one or two serious attacks, maintained its dignity and suffered little damage. It might have conquered had it not been for the military contests that robbed it of its future.

"Foundations" was a composite work left unchallenged. The Anglo-Catholic Congress Papers form a composite book, but it would be a mistake to judge them as being in any way controversial. They are merely concerned with the problem of demonstrating the nature and truth of Christianity in the modern world. The conclusion is simple—"we have the truth."

One wishes that this book had been given a title more indicative of its contents. "Outspoken Essays" would have been advantageous. As it stands it may escape notice, which would be a calamity. It contains in all twenty-seven addresses, papers and sermons, delivered, read or preached before the Congress held in London in July, 1920. No one could have made a better selection of subjects than Dr. Darwell Stone, to whom this work was entrusted. A paper on Canon Law would have added enormously to that part of the book which deals with the historic side of the Catholic position. Anglo-Catholics have resources in this field which they have never brought to light.

To Catholics this book is of immense value. One habitually thinks of the Catholic movement in terms of propaganda, not always certain of its main principles nor confident about its guiding factors. The book is in this sense a revelation and an assurance. It is not addressed to the critics, it is addressed to the world. Nor is it the last word which we shall hear from its authors.

Faith and wisdom, intelligence, devotion, scholarship and practicality are a formidable combination of virtues and graces not likely to dissolve from fear of any opposition or misunderstanding. They are the factors, the human factors, upon which the Anglo-Catholic movement ought to and does rely. The contents of this report sufficiently reverse the claim that the Catholic movement in the Anglican Communion is a "spent force," and its publication and acceptance disprove the charge, still occa-

sionally heard, that orthodoxy in these modern days is nothing more than mute arrogance. C. W. B.

Bible Readings for Schools, Heroes and Kings. Oxford University Press.

Of the present volume there is little to be said but that it contains well-selected readings from the books of Judges, Samuel and Kings, without comment, but arranged in such a way as to be helpful to teachers and pupils, the large type and well drawn illustrations lending an interest to the somewhat difficult passages.

This is the first of a series which we would like to see extended to other portions of the Bible. W. H. B.